DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 386 790 EA 026 993

AUTHOR DeStefano, Lizanne; And Others
TITLE Issues in the Evaluation of a Multi-Site Federal System Change Initiative.
PUB DATE [Apr 95]
NOTE 90p.
PUB TYPE Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Disabilities; Educational Research; *Education Work Relationship; Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluation Research; *Federal Legislation; Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Research Design; *State Programs

ABSTRACT

In 1991, the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Services (OSERS) authorized, under the Individuals with Disabilities Act (IDEA), a specific grants program. The State Systems for Transitions Services for Youth with Disabilities Program made available competitive 5-year grants to individual states for establishing responsive state systems that address the school-to-work transition needs of youth with disabilities. This paper describes the evaluation-design process for assessing the effectiveness of the 30 funded sites. The evaluation focused on three areas of system change--youth and family engagement in transition, professional skills and knowledge, and agency-community collaboration. Data were gathered from a review of strategies, evidence of change, and supports/constraints; annual interviews with project directors; and collection of contextual information. Preliminary analysis identified 10 initial influences of the systems-change projects: (1) multiple strategies for change; (2) increased numbers of transition personnel within state education agencies; (3) increased responsiveness of interagency mechanisms; (4) expanded state and local professional-development opportunities; (5) increased availability and quality of transition services; (6) increased parent access to information and training; (7) increased participation of youth with disabilities in state school-to-work initiatives; (8) improved state-level evaluation systems; (9) increased participation of underrepresented groups; and (10) increased availability and access to information on transition policies, programs, and practices. Appendices contain the conceptual framework; sample strategies, evidence of change, and supports/constraints; the project directors' interview protocol; a sample interview; data sources; an activity matrix; a sample state description; and the evaluation timeline. (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED 386 790

Issues in the Evaluation of a Multi-site Federal System Change Initiative

Lizanne DeStefano, University of Illinois
Susan Hasazi, University of Vermont
Brian Cobb, Colorado State University
David Johnson and Barbara Guy, University of Minnesota
Kay Shriner, University of Arkansas

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
L. DeStefano
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Purpose of the Paper

This paper reports on an attempt to evaluate a federal initiative under trying but typical circumstances. Given a large number of geographically dispersed sites, funded under the same initiative but quite different in terms of goals, activities, and impacts, the evaluators were charged with the task of describing and assessing the impact of the entire initiatives. Though each of the 30 funded sites were conducting their own evaluations, the scope and focus of these varied greatly. The evaluation described in this paper was designed to assess the common impacts and unique accomplishments of an array of projects, making maximum use of existing data and minimizing the burden on project director's for new data collection. The design is participatory, involving project directors in planning the evaluation, reporting and reflecting on their own project impact, and validating the evaluation findings. It is hoped that the design of the evaluation might be applicable to similar large scale, multi-site initiatives.

Overview of the Transition Systems Change Program

In FY91, the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Services (OSERS) authorized, under Section 626(e) of IDEA, a special grants program, specifically intended to make available one-time, five-year grants, on a competitive basis, to

EA 026 993

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

individual states for the purpose of establishing responsive state systems that address the school-to-work transition needs of youth with disabilities. These state-level projects are cooperative efforts, jointly undertaken by state education and vocational rehabilitation agencies. Each state-level project is charged with the responsibility of "developing effective strategies and procedures for implementing the new transition service requirements contained within Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 1990" (Federal Register, vol. 56, no. 112, June 11, 1991).

Beginning in 1991, the systems change program enabled states and localities to begin implementation of the transition service requirements of IDEA. Although the final regulations did not receive approval until late 1992; the state grants program was instrumental in supporting early implementation efforts in those states initially funded in 1991. Since this time, the state systems change projects have served as an important base of support to state education agencies, in partnership with other state and local agencies, in increasing the capacity of states to improve the postschool outcomes and community adjustment of youth with disabilities.

As authorized under section 626(e) of IDEA, the State Systems for Transition Services for Youth with Disabilities Program is intended to address the following goals:

- Develop effective strategies and procedures for implementing the new transition service requirements contained within Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 1990.
- Increase the availability, access, and quality of transition assistance through the development and improvement of policies, procedures, systems, and other mechanisms for youth with disabilities and families.
- Improve the ability of professionals, parents, and advocates to work with youth with disabilities in ways that promote the understanding of and the capability to successfully make the transition from school to adult life.

- Improve working relationships and collaboration among those who are, or should be, involved in the delivery of transition services, in order to identify and achieve consensus on the general nature and specific application of transition services to meet the needs of youth with disabilities.
- Create an incentive for accessing for accessing and using the existing expertise and resources, or developing expertise and resources, in programs, projects, and activities related to transition.

Relationship of the Program to Other Policies and School Reforms

Since the inception of the program in 1991, the goals and responsibilities of these state systems change projects have expanded in response to several federal and state school reform efforts. The School-to-Work Opportunities Act of 1994, Goals 2000: Educate America Act, and the Improving America School Act (IASA, the re-authorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act), for example, promote comprehensive strategies for improving public school programs for *all* students. These federal education reforms are based on high academic and occupational standards, strategies for improving teaching, and strengthening family involvement. Many of these reforms have specifically focused on improving the quality of high school programs through initiatives such as the School-to-Work Opportunities Act, specific provisions of Goals 2000: Educate America Act, as well as the National Education Goals.

Several of these new federal initiatives are consistent with and complementary to the State Systems for Transition Services for Youth with Disabilities Program. Within individual states, the state systems change projects are becoming an integral a part of the transformation of high school programs that addresses and supports the needs and interests of *all* students. These federal initiatives, along with other state education reform efforts, have placed additional responsibilities on the state systems change projects. Principally, this has meant a shift in responsibility to align the IDEA transition mandates (as well as other requirements of IDEA) with these federal, state, and local

school reform efforts. This is to ensure that students with disabilities are fully considered as part of state and local planning for regular education, and not regarded solely as special education's responsibility.

Status of the Transition State Systems Change Program

To date, 30 states have received grant awards, and four additional states will be funded during FY95. The list of the 30 currently funded states is provided below:

Arkansas	California	Colorado
Connecticut	Florida	Hawaii
Indiana	Iowa	Kansas
Kentucky	Michigan	Maine
Massachusetts	New Hampshire	Minnesota
Nebraska	New York	New Jersey
New Mexico	North Dakota	North Carolina
Oregon	Texas	Ohio
Vermont	Virginia	Utah
West Virginia	Wisconsin	Washington

The Role of the National Transition Network

In 1992, OSERS established a cooperative agreement with the University of Minnesota to establish the National Transition Network. The Network was established for the purpose of providing technical assistance and evaluation services to states implementing systems change projects on transition. NTN was charged with the task of evaluating the transition system change initiative.

Issues Affecting the Evaluation

The overriding evaluation goal was to describe the context and nature of change as it occurred over the five years of the system change initiative. Specifically the evaluation was designed to assess the impact of the system change projects on: (a) the provision of transition services resulting from the activities of the state projects;

(b) the design and implementation of professional development activities at state and local levels; and (c) the extent to which agencies are cooperating effectively; (d) the extent to which obstacles exist in achieving appropriate levels of interagency coordination and cooperation, and (e) the extent to which federal and state laws create disincentives to that coordination and cooperation.

The design was constrained by several factors: (a) the need to be sensitive to differences as well as similarities across states; (b) limited capacity (in terms of time and money) on the part of the state system change project directors to provide evaluation information; and (c) limited authority on the part of NTN staff to require project directors to collect and report data.

Evaluation Method

In order to increase ownership, willingness to participate and utility, the evaluation was developed using multiple levels of input from project directors. On August 30, 1993, NTN staff proposed a conceptual framework to all project directors and requested feedback (See Appendix A). The model was designed to tell the story of how system change occurred in the state over time, taking into account the unique context of states as will as the specific strategies used to promote change. Change strategies were categorized using a system developed by Lorraine McDonald and Richard Elmore (1987). They described four types of change strategies: mandates, inducements, capacity-building and system-changing activities. Mandates refer to policies, rules, and directives that are intended to produce compliance. Inducements offer money or other incentives to individuals and agencies in return for certain actions. Capacity building involves activities aimed at changing attitudes and increasing knowledge and skills. System changing activities result in changes in responsibilities, resources authority and communication patterns among and within agencies.

The evaluation approach was sensitive to the idea that each state grant is

unique and has approached system change with differing strategies and activities. The evaluation sought to document the context and strategies associated with change, the evidence of change associated with each change strategy, and the factors which enhanced or inhibited change. See Figure 1.

Figure 1. Conceptual Framework

AREAS	QUESTIONS			
	What was and is the context for change?	What strategies were used?	What is the evidence of change?	What were the supports and constraints influencing implementation?
Agency and Community Collaboration	Grant proposals, continuation proposals Interviews with project directors			
Youth and Family Engagement	Parent Survey Certification Survey			
Professional Skills and Knowledge	Other Documents			

Finally to constrain the amount of time and effort spent on data collection by both project directors and NTN staff, yet produce an evaluation that was comprehensive and useful, it was decided that the evaluation should make as much use as possible of information currently collected as part of the evaluation component of states' projects and of other existing information such as initial applications, progress reports and continuation applications.

A subcommittee of project directors met in October, 1993 to review the feedback and refine the evaluation design. The first recommendation was to narrow the focus of the evaluation to three specific areas of system change: youth and family engagement in transition, professional skills and knowledge, and agency and community

collaboration. These areas were rated as most important and most central to the majority of the system change projects. As a strategies for explaining the evaluation to the project directors, the evaluation subcommittee suggested that examples of strategies, evidence of change, and supports and constraints in each area be drafted by NTN staff and reviewed by the subcommittee (See Appendix B).

It also was suggested that annual interviews with project directors were efficient ways to collect information common to all projects and to document changes that had occurred in the project over the past year. NTN staff then drafted the interview component of the evaluation and piloted it in three states. Questions were revised. Final copies of the interview protocols (Appendix C) and a sample interview (Appendix D) are attached.

Finally, a strategy for collecting contextual information about the state in general, about each of the three areas of system changes targeted in the evaluation, and about the activities of the system change project. Descriptions of how contextual information was collected is included in Appendix E. An activity matrix designed to summarize project activities is included in Appendix F. A sample of state description is included in Appendix G.

The subcommittee presented a final version of the evaluation at the Project Director's Meeting on April 23, 1994. The Evaluation plan was approved by the project directors at that time.

The evaluation began in May 1994 and proceeded according to the timeline included in Appendix H.

Evaluation Findings

Preliminary analysis has identified ten initial influences of the systems change projects:

(1)multiple strategies for system change

(2)increased numbers of transition personnel within state education agencies;

(3) increased responsiveness of interagency mechanisms;

(4) expanded state and local professional development opportunities;

(5) increased the availability, access and quality of transition services for youth with disabilities;

(6) increased parent access to information and training;

(7) increased participation of youth with disabilities in state school-to-work initiatives and other educational reforms;

(8) improved state level evaluation and accountability systems on transition;

(9) increased participation of under-represented groups in state and local systems change activities; and

(10) increased availability and access to information on transition policies, programs, and practices.

Further discussion of these areas and examples of state impacts are provided below. The individual state scenarios are presented only as selected examples of the scope and type of impact now occurring within states, they do not represent a complete description of the effect of the system change projects.

Multiple Strategies for System Change

The most common system change strategies used by projects were inducements and capacity building. These were most often in the form of small grants to local school districts and in-service professional development. Only a few incidents of mandates and system changing strategies were cited, however, these were perceived by project directors to have a larger impact than inducements and capacity building.

Increased Personnel with Full-time Commitment to Transition Services

Each state participating in the systems change program has committed project funds for the purpose of employing an individual or individuals to support the development and implementation of transition programs. Over 150 individuals have

been hired at the state, regional, and local levels to assume full-time responsibility for transition services. In many states, positions initially supported through federal funds, have shifted, or are being shifted to other state and local sources. These states are committed to employing or re-assigning existing state agency personnel to carry on the development and implementation of transition services following the five-year federal funding period.

In comparing funded states to those states which have not received systems change projects, it is evident that state administrative commitments to transition have not occurred. In the 20 unfunded states, as well as the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico, only 1 state has employed an individual for the full-time purpose of addressing the transition service requirements of IDEA. In those states without federal assistance, progress has been delayed in implementing the transition service requirements.

Increased Responsiveness of Interagency Mechanisms that Promote Systems Change

A major emphasis in each of the state systems change projects is the improvement of transition programs and services statewide, through high levels of interagency coordination and collaboration. Interagency developments have occurred at the state level, regional or community levels, as well as within local schools. Impact of these efforts is evidenced by shared responsibility for planning and the delivery of transition services, co-funded and co-sponsored programs among agencies, and formal and informal policy formulation.

To be eligible to receive a systems change project, a joint application must be submitted by the state education and state vocational rehabilitation agency. This is the only grant program made available through OSERS that requires a joint application submission between two independent agencies. This has resulted in strengthening the connection between special education and vocational rehabilitation programs in the planning and delivery of school and postschool services. Overall, special education was the receiving agent for 57% of the state projects. The majority of the

remaining projects went to vocational rehabilitation. Many states have housed their project coordinator in the offices of a collaborating agency or a neutral site. Representatives from JTPA programs, trade and industry, adult mental health services, parent centers, and other groups and organizations have been successfully involved on state, regional, and local interagency teams. Selected state examples include:

- Washington has developed a memorandum of agreement with local special education directors to match state and local funds to the federal vocational rehabilitation formula. This will allow the state of Washington to maximize aid available from the federal-state rehabilitation program and result in the statewide development of cooperative school and vocational rehabilitation programs. State agency vocational rehabilitation counselors will become directly aligned with high schools to provide services to transitioning students with disabilities. Similar arrangements have occurred in Oregon, North Carolina, Texas, and Nebraska.
- Vermont has established a memorandum of agreement between the state education agency, Department of Human Services (MR Division), and the state vocational rehabilitation program that makes students ages 18-22 a priority for Medicaid services. State vocational rehabilitation direct service funds are matched with Medicaid funds to provide for a variety of essential transition services. As a result of this agreement, students with severe disabilities have available to them job coaches and other services upon graduation. One outcome of this arrangement is to minimize the current waiting list problem in the state.
- Hawaii was one of the first states to implement a "one-stop-shop" program that provides job search and employment services. A total of 10 Department of Labor transition centers have been established statewide. The I Hawaii Systems Change Project currently funds a part-time special education teacher to work cooperatively with these transition centers to ensure that students with disabilities have access to these job services. The purpose here is to build the capacity of these transition

centers to serve high school students with disabilities on an ongoing basis beyond the availability of federal funding.

- The Connecticut state systems change project has established a 13th year program that provides youth with disabilities additional educational opportunities and vocational training to prepare them for postschool employment and community living.
- In California, an agreement has been established between the state education agency, vocational rehabilitation program, state mental retardation and mental health divisions, and several other agencies to develop a combined individualized planning and referral processes. This means that the past practice of establishing independent IEPs, IWRPs, ISPs, IHPs, and other plans will no longer need to occur as a student exits from school. This is anticipated to produce a major cost saving to agencies and improve the coordination and delivery of services to students with disabilities and families as they transition from school to work and community living.

Expanded Professional Development Opportunities

Professional development has occurred at the continuing education as well as preservice levels. To date, literally thousands of administrators, professionals, parents, and students have received multiple trainings through these systems change projects. Continuing education efforts have emphasized the cross-training of professionals to promote collaborative interagency approaches when addressing the transition service needs of youth with disabilities. General education high school teachers and staff have also been included in these training initiatives. Training topics have included the infusion of transition in IEPs, interagency teaming, self determination, and a wide variety of other issues. While several states without systems change grants have provided training on incorporating transition goals and objectives in IEPs, they have not provided other training on the actual implementation of transition services.

System change projects have also collaborated in the development of

university courses on transition. These courses have been included within preservice training programs that prepare special education, vocational education, and vocational rehabilitation professionals. In several states, teacher certification and licensing standards are being addressed. Training is also provided to parents and students, usually orchestrated through parent centers. Selected state level examples include:

- New Mexico has used project funds as seed money for a university to establish a rehabilitation counseling program with an emphasis on school-to-work transition.
- West Virginia is implementing a Next Steps training program with local teams that involves parents and students. It is anticipated that this program will be implemented statewide by the end of the project. Colorado has undertaken similar training.
- Nebraska has established a school rehabilitation counselor endorsement as part of their overall education certification and licensing structure. This position will be co-funded through state special education and vocational rehabilitation resources, as well as local education agency funds.
- Utah has provided training to transition teams involving over 600 professionals, parents, and other community members. By the end of the project, it is anticipated that they will have provided training to a transition team in each school district.

Increased Availability, Access, and Quality of Transition Assistance for Youth with Disabilities

Each state systems change project has implemented state, regional, and local approaches to improving the availability, access, and quality of transition assistance for youth with disabilities. For example, state projects outlay a portion of their project funds to support regional and local demonstration sites. Over 1,000 demonstration sites will be funded by the end of FY97. Of greater significance is the thousands of students with disabilities who receive

training through the systems change program nationally. All 20 states without systems change grants have provided some training to professionals, but few have provided training to students.

Many of the states have capitalized on early OSERS model demonstration projects in developing specific state and local strategies. The self-determination projects, for example, have had a major impact in assisting system change projects in the development of strategies that promote student participation in transition planning/IEP meetings. These efforts also include increasing student access to and participation in adult education and postsecondary training programs. The development, refinement, and implementation of transition strategies has also occurred through such activities as: the promotion of student and parent participation in planning and decision making for school and postschool transition services; and the improvement of IEP/transition planning processes using person-centered planning, personal futures planning, and other approaches. Selected state examples include:

- The Massachusetts Department of Employment and Training has committed funds to initiate local projects that involve students with disabilities. This effort is coordinated with the state school-to-work implementation project with the intent of developing strategies and models that can be adopted statewide when serving students with disabilities.
- Colorado has established a school-to-work transition program for incarcerated juveniles and young adults; The state systems change project has established a critical link to the state's criminal justice program in an effort to serve students with disabilities as they exit state and regional correctional facilities.
- Iowa and several other state systems change projects are developing specialized training programs for students with disabilities. Student training has included such topics as self-determination, self-advocacy, sharing information on community resources and services, developing communication skills and strategies for

participating in transition planning/IEP meetings, and others. Efforts have been made to create materials that are reflective of different cultural backgrounds. Literally thousands of students have received training nationwide.

- In Minnesota, the state systems change project has provided training to over 500 students statewide. To date, 30 students have been trained as trainers, mentors, and coaches to other students to promote student participation in transition/IEP planning. Approximately 2,000 additional students in Minnesota have received training and support from these student trainers.
- Hawaii has established a cooperative agreement between its regional community college system and high schools for the purposes of serving students with disabilities at the postsecondary level. The Hawaii state systems change project has provided training to community college staff in the areas of reasonable accommodation, assessment and planning, and other strategies that support the participation of youth with disabilities in these training programs.
- California has established a demonstration effort with one of its major community college sites for the purposes of developing strategies for serving youth with disabilities. Promising practices developed through this demonstration project will be shared statewide throughout California's community college system.

Increased Parent and Student Access to Information and Training Regarding Transition

Representatives from the national Technical Assistance to Parent Programs (TAPP) of Boston, Massachusetts, and PACER Center of Minneapolis, Minnesota, participate as technical advisors to the National Transition Network. The Network has undertaken concerted efforts to develop appropriate materials and make direct connections with parent centers across the United States. The purpose here is to ensure that parent centers have available to them information regarding effective transition programming for students with disabilities that they, in turn, can share with

family members at the local level.

TAPP and PACER Center report that prior to the implementation of the systems change grant program fewer than five parent information centers (PICs) placed an emphasis on providing parents information on transition. At the present time, all PICs now have available information that they routinely share with parents that address the transition of youth with disabilities. In particular, PICs now have information regarding the transition service requirements of IDEA that can be readily shared with parents.

Each state systems change project has also involved representatives of state and local parent centers and other parent group s, i.e., ARC's, LDA's, others, as staff and consultants on their state systems change projects. An estimated $750,000 go out each year from the state systems change projects to establish subcontracts with parent centers and organizations to undertake specific project activities. These activities have included the development of materials, participation in parent and student training programs, providing technical assistance to state, as well as participation on key advisory committees and boards.

Increased Participation of State Systems Change Projects in State School-to-Work Initiatives and Other Educational Reforms

This year, eight states received federal funds to establish School-to-Work Implementation Projects as authorized under the School-to-Work Opportunity Act of 1994. Each of these eight states also has a state systems change project addressing the transition service needs of students with disabilities. In all states, systems change project staff are involved with their state School-to-Work Implementation Projects. Involvement levels vary, however, overall, substantial progress has been made in assuring that youth with disabilities are considered within these state implementation projects. Systems change project staff are integrally involved in project planning and provide technical assistance, and in several states co-funded training and demonstration efforts are occurring. Selected state examples include:

- The Kentucky model of transition planning developed through the systems change project for youth with disabilities is currently being considered for statewide adoption and use with all students. This means that a consistent framework for developing transition plans may occur for students in general education as well as special education.
- The New Jersey systems change project for students with disabilities is currently housed within the state Office of School-to-Work Initiatives. The School-to-Work Implementation Project has committed $600,000 for three demonstration projects intended to serve students with disabilities in school-based and work-based programs. Systems change project staff will provide technical assistance and consultation to these demonstration projects.
- In Oregon, systems change project staff participate on the internal management team and work closely with local partnership demonstration projects. Currently, the systems change project and School-to-Work Implementation Project staff are developing a joint training and technical assistance program for general education, vocational education, special education, and other personnel. In addition, one position is currently being cost shared between the state systems project for youth with disabilities and the state School-to-Work Implementation initiative.
- In Michigan, the systems change demonstration activities for youth with disabilities have been merged with the general education school-based and work-based demonstration efforts. This level of coordination helps to ensure that youth with disabilities are included in the broader state implementation project demonstration activities.
- In Kentucky, Michigan, and Oregon state systems change project staff have participated in the development of RFP criteria for local partnership demonstration projects by including criteria that assures that students with disabilities will have the opportunity to participate in these activities.

Improved State Level Evaluation and Accountability Systems on Transition

State systems change projects are instituting varied procedures for evaluating and improving the overall accountability of transition programs and services. These evaluation systems include methods for documenting and anticipating the future service needs of students with disabilities, collecting and reporting postschool follow-up information on former special education students, sharing state school exit data with other state agencies, and other evaluation strategies. Many of the procedures now used by the state systems change projects are based on previous research and model demonstration projects sponsored by OSERS in recent years.

Few programs so clearly utilize student outcomes as a tool for evaluation and program planning than have the systems change projects. This use parallels the intent of the outcomes focus articulated in Goals 2000: Educate America Act. Further, the follow-up evaluation procedures and methodology currently being developed by state systems change projects have broader applicability within state School-to-Work Implementation Projects. These implementation projects will be required to gather outcome information that reports on the post-high school status of young adults participating in school-to-work programs. Selected state examples include:

- Arkansas, North Dakota, and several other states have developed formal systems for gathering and reporting on the anticipated service needs of youth with disabilities who are about to exit their high school programs. This information is shared with the state vocational rehabilitation and human services agencies. Such information has been useful in examining waiting list problems and encouraging discussions and actions concerning future service development within states.
- In Florida, planning is currently underway to establish a postschool follow-up system that reports information on former general education as well as special education students.
- Vermont is currently using data from its postschool indicators (PSI) system as a state

"report card." This information is shared statewide and allows for comparisons among regions of the state regarding the postschool status of young adults with disabilities.

Increased Participation of Underrepresented Groups in State and Local Systems Change Activities

The systems change program is one of the few that requires the participation of underrepresented groups. An important part of this has been the emphasis placed on employing persons for under-represented groups in key project staff roles. Over 50 individuals with disabilities, persons from differing multi-cultural backgrounds, and other underrepresented groups currently serve in project staff positions, are aligned with project demonstration efforts, and routinely participate on project advisory councils and interagency planning teams at the state, regional/community, and local levels.

Increased Availability and Access to Information on Transition Policies, Programs, and Practices

Individual state projects, the National Transition Network, and the collaborating parent centers have all contributed to the base of information now available concerning transition policies, programs, and practices. Each actively disseminates this information within their states as well as nationally. Materials are developed specifically for federal and state agency administrative staff; for educators, rehabilitation counselors, and other professionals; for students with disabilities; and parents. This has included a wide array of print and media resources. Other information dissemination strategies include teleconferences, production of directories that promote networking among states, an annual project directors meeting, and other strategies. Many of these activities are coordinated with the five Regional Resource Centers (RRC's) and the Federal Resource Center (FRC). Selected examples of these efforts include:

- TAPP and PACER Center, in collaboration with the National Transition Network have produced a series of four Parent Briefs that describe specific provisions of the transition service requirements of IDEA. These Parent Briefs have been shared with all parent centers nationally as well as communicated in national and state conferences. To date, over 6,000 copies of each Parent Brief have been disseminated across the nation.
- The National Transition Network, in cooperation with OSERS, published and disseminated a handbook detailing the specific requirements of the Fair Labor Standards Act when involving students with disabilities in community-based vocational programs. This handbook has been disseminated to over 6,000 state and local agencies nationwide.
- The National Transition Network has published a series of Policy Updates that discusses the implications of new federal legislation in relation to youth with disabilities from school-to-work and community living. Policy Updates have focused on federal policies concerning school-to-work, Goals 2000: Educate America Act, vocational rehabilitation, vocational education, developmental disabilities, Social Security Administration, and several others. The Policy Updates are disseminated to federal, state, and local administrative staff and direct service personnel. Over 50,000 Policy Updates have been disseminated nationally.
- Teleconferences and other opportunities for state systems change project staff to network among one another have also been established by the National Transition Network. Monthly, or more frequent, teleconferences are conducted addressing a wide range of topics and issues of concern to state agency personnel. The National Transition Network also publishes a directory of state systems change projects that provide key contact information as well as descriptions of current project activities and publications. This directory is viewed as an important strategy in promoting networking and encouraging states to share information on promising practices

among one another.

- The National Transition Network also encourages state and local agencies and groups to actively disseminate and share its publications with individuals with disabilities, family member, and other agency personnel at the state and local levels. This has significantly expanded the dissemination of Network products and information on a national basis.

Sustaining and Magnifying the Impact

Observations of the Federal Monitoring of States

The state systems change projects are well into the process of developing effective strategies and procedures for implementing the new transition service requirements contained within Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Their emphasis has been in the broad areas of interagency cooperation and collaboration, professional development, local demonstration activities, policy formulation, information dissemination, and program evaluation. These efforts demonstrate that the "implementation" of transition services requirement of IDEA is more than the inclusion of transition requirements on IEPs.

Current criteria used in the federal compliance monitoring process, however, focuses on the existence of specific information on a few selected IEPs. While these data may identify procedural compliance, they do not measure the success of transition implementation, nor the effects of the systems change projects on transition. Much can be learned from the state systems change program in terms of the types of criteria and measures that reflect the complex nature of state and local program efforts to implement the transition service requirements. This would include such factors as level and impact of interagency collaboration, quality and effectiveness of school programs, postschool outcomes of former special education students, and individual and family satisfaction with services.

Federal Commitment to Implementation of Transition Services

The implied promise of Section 626(e), the State Systems for Transition Services for Youth with Disabilities Program, was to fund all 50 states, plus the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico. There remains strong interest among the unfunded states to participate in the state systems change program. During the FY95 competition, 13 states (Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Idaho, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, and Tennessee) and the District of Columbia competed for four grant awards. Determinations are now being made as to which states will receive a federal grant award. Other unfunded states are Delaware, Georgia, Illinois, Nevada, Oklahoma, Puerto Rico, South Carolina, and Wyoming.

Summary Observations

It is likely that the focus of federally sponsored systems change activities will continue to support change at the state level. States without the opportunity to participate in the systems change grants program are unlikely to be able to participate successfully in other federal initiatives (e.g., school-to-work, others). Federal funds have been instrumental in mobilizing state and local agencies to address the transition requirements of Part B of IDEA and initiate other improvements in school and community services.

One way to think about systems change projects is to view them as supplementary or assistive funding to "unfunded" federal mandates -- seed funds that enable states to begin to respond to federal mandates as they build their own fiscal capacity and strategies for change at the state and local levels. New ways of thinking about government and reform rely on rethinking systems that allow laws, rhetoric, and intentions to be fulfilled. One way that this can be accomplished is to provide systems change funds that allow for experimentation and creative thinking to foster change at the state and local levels.

While too early to tell, the ultimate impact of state systems change efforts

centers on improving the postschool outcomes of youth with disabilities. Evaluations of the postschool outcomes of these young adults is critical in establishing a link between the scope and nature of systems change project activities and their real impact on affecting positive student outcomes in adult life. As these systems change grants conclude, individual states will, to the extent possible, report on such findings.

These preliminary findings suggest that states are investing heavily in the development of strong collaborative relationships at the state, regional, and local levels; experimenting in the design and development of "promising" or "best" practices; undertaking comprehensive programs of professional development, including cross-training initiatives; and engaging students and family members in a variety of project training, technical assistance, and demonstration activities. These all relate to changes and improvements within the overall system of service delivery that support the transition of youth with disabilities from school-to-work and community living.

Comments on the Evaluation

Now in its second year of implementation, the evaluation of the transition system change initiative has been judged successful by its OSEP funders, NTN implementers and state level participants. Even those audiences who had expected and advocated for an evaluation design that required standardized collection of a small number of quantitative variables across all sites, have commented upon the validity and richness of the evaluation findings. Allowing project directors to influence the evaluation design and to report upon their own project accomplishments has increased their ownership and willingness to participate in the evaluation. Likewise, earnest efforts to reduce the burden on project director's and increase use of existing information has been greatly appreciated and resulted in very positive responses to the evaluation.

Appendix A

Conceptual Framework: Original Memorandum to States

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES

Memorandum

To: State Systems Change Project Directors and Coordinators
From: Bill Halloran and National Transition Network Staff
Re: Evaluation Planning for Assessing System Change
Date: August 25, 1993

Over the past few months, many of you have been speaking with us about issues related to your project evaluation and the evaluation roll the NTN will assume of the initiative as a whole. A few weeks ago, NTN staff met to discuss and plan aspects of the evaluation process. This memo summarizes our thinking at that meeting. We hope that you will provide us with your reactions to this plan and offer suggestions on how it might be improved. With your feedback, we intend to convene a working group comprised of project directors, OSERS staff, and NTN staff to finalize and operationalize the plan.

One of our major goals is to constrain the amount of time that each of you will need to spend collecting information for the evaluation, yet to produce an evaluation that is comprehensive and useful to you and others across the country. To the extent possilbe, we intend that this evaluation will make use of the information you are currently collecting as part of the evaluation component of your state's project, while providing a means for collecting some information that is consistent across all the system change projects. For example, those of you who are using follow-up evaluations in your states could use outcome data as evidence of change in your states. Likewise, evaluation from local demonstration sites may be used to document local impact of your project. We also hope that some of the information that we collect as part of our evaluation will be useful to you as you prepare your own state's evaluation report. We would especially like to hear your comments on the time requirements of this plan and any suggestions you may have about ways in which this plan can further complement your own evaluation.

The Model

We have attempted to construct a model that will tell the story of how change has occurred over time, taking into account the unique contexts of your states as well as the strategies you have used to promote change. To keep it simple, we have categorized

the various strategies for change using a system developed by Lorraine McDonald and Richard Elmore (1987). They describe four types of change strategies including mandates, inducements, capacity-building, and system-changing activities. Mandates refer to policies, rules, and directives that are intended to produce compliance. Inducements offer money or other incentives to individuals and agencies to in return for certain actions. Capacity building involves activities aimed at changing attitudes and increasing skills and knowledge. System changing activities result in changes in responsibilities, resources, authority and communication patterns among and within agencies. Does this seem a logical and reasonable way to represent the efforts you are undertaking to effect system change in your state?

We recognize that each state grant is unique and has approached system change with differing strategies and activities. The evaluation approach we adopt will capture this individuality at the same time allowing us to describe commonalties across projects. In addition to the context and strategies associated with change, the proposed evaluation plan includes collection of information about the evidence of change associated with each change strategy and the factors which enhanced or inhibited change.

In summary, the evaluation that we are proposing would attempt to answer four questions related to the above:

1. What was and is the context for change?
2. What strategies were used to effect system change (mandates, inducements, capacity-building, and system-changing)?
3. What is the evidence of change relative to these strategies?
4. With regard to each strategy, what were the supports and constraints that influenced implementation of the change effort?

Our overriding goal is to describe the context and nature of change as it occurred over the five years of the system change initiative.

The Method

The methodology for this evaluation is emerging and depends very much on the input we receive from you and the working group of project directors that will assist us in finalizing the evaluation plan. An illustration of the emerging methodology is provided in Table 1. The types and sources of information are provided only as examples. The actual types and sources of information collected for evaluation purposes depends upon the specific work of each project.

We have also given some thought to what you will be asked to do, other information we will use in the evaluation, and your time commitment. We are especially interested in your input on these aspects of the evaluation.

What You Will be Asked to Do

The specifics of what you will be asked to do will be determined by the working group, but we can comment on this in a general sense. Several times a year, your technical assistance contact person will ask you to respond by phone or in writing to questions related to context, strategies for change, evidence of change, and barriers and enhancers to change. It is our intent to have each request be short and well designed. You will be notified well in advance, you will have plenty of time to respond, and all attempts will be made to schedule these requests at your convenience.

Other Information We Will Use

Much of the information that we will use for the evaluation will be gleaned by our staff from reports that you are already required to prepare such as your original application, semi-annual progress reports, continuation proposals, and final reports. In addition, a small portion of each annual site visit will be devoted to reviewing the evaluation information we have compiled for your state during the year, so that you can check its accuracy and make necessary additions and corrections.

Your Time Commitment

We anticipate that you will be asked to spend no more than an hour to an hour and a half a month on average on this effort. We want to assure you that we will not ask for any more time than is absolutely necessary.

We look forward to hearing your comments on this proposed plan. Please call or write Barb Guy, Rm 6, Pattee Hall, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 55545, (612) 624-8371 with your comments by September 15, 1993. At that time, we will invite a few project directors to participate in the working group to be scheduled some time in October.

Examples of Potential Evaluation Elements

Evaluation Question	Possible Areas We Might Collect Information About:	Possible Sources Where We Might Get the Information:	People Responsible for Collecting and Synthesizing Information
What is the context for change?	Size Economic climate Political history Leadership Organization structure	Application/analysis of continuation proposals or progress reports Interviews with Project Directors Surveys completed by state project staff	NTN staff review of documents assimilated by project director as part of regular tasks NTN staff/Project Directors NTN staff/Project Directors
What strategies were used to effect systems change?	Training workshops Local demonstration projects Follow-up, follow along system Transition policies related to IEP Interagency working groups Involvement of under represented populations	Application/analysis of continuation proposals or progress reports Interviews with Project Directors	NTN staff review of documents assimilated by project director as part of regular tasks NTN staff/Project Directors
What is the evidence of change relative to the strategies?	Synthesis of participant evaluations Local evaluations of the funded projects The inclusion of transition goals in IEPs Breadth of extent of interagency participation Extent of local participation in follow-up/follow-along system	Continuation proposal or progress reports Interview with project director or local continuation proposals Continuation proposal or final report Interview with project director; continuation proposal or final reports Summary of follow-up data/continuation or final report Interviews	Collection of each of these pieces of information will be the responsibility of project director as part of regular tasks. NTN staff will be responsible for interviews and review of documents.

Table 1 (cont'd)

Evaluation Question	Possible Areas We Might Collect Information About:	Possible Sources Where We Might Get the Information:	People Responsible for Collecting and Synthesizing Information
What were the supports and contraints?	Environmental and practical factors that influenced the impact of the training workshops	Interviews	NTN staff
	Environmental and practical factors that influenced the impact of the local demonstration projects	Interviews	NTN staff
	Environmental and practical factors that influenced the impact of the transition policies related to IEPs	Interviews	NTN staff
	Environmental and practical factors that influenced the impact of the interagency working groups	Interviews	NTN staff
	Environmental and practical factors that influenced the impact of the follow-up,follow-along system	Interviews	NTN staff
	Environmental and practical factors that influenced theinvolvement of under-represented populations	Interviews	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix B

Sample Strategies, Evidence of Effectiveness, and Supports and Constraints

EVALUATION AREA: YOUTH AND FAMILY ENGAGEMENT IN TRANSITION

Relevant Project Goals: _____

Strategies Used to Effect Systems Change	Evidence of Change Relative to the Strategies	Supports and Constraints Relative to the Strategies
Information dissemination on types and availability of services including outreach to underrepresented populations	Increased family requests for services including those families and youth who are typically under-represented	Established dissemination network, Services change faster than written materials
Student empowerment training including outreach to underrepresented populations	Evidence of student involvement in IEP, board and committee meetings including those who are typically under-represented	Parental and team support, Lack of student attendance
Parent and student workshops conducted in alternative formats and languages	Evidence of family involvement in IEP, board and committee meetings Representation of parents/students on advisory boards including those who are typically under-represented	Family knowledge of transition, access to targeted population
Transition policies/practices related to IEP and planning process including outreach to underrepresented populations	Inclusion of student and family preferences on IEPs & IWRPs	Authority to make and implement changes, Professional knowledge of strategies
Child care support and mileage reimbursement to attend transition-planning seminars	Increased attendance in traditionally low attendance state regions Multiple points for "intake".	Available funds, transportation and qualified child care

This form is only an example of the strategies, evidence of change, and supports and constraints that a state might identify.
It is in no way inclusive.
Each state will have different strategies, corresponding evidence of change, and supports and constraints.
In some cases, the strategies may be the same, but the proof of change and the corresponding supports and constraints will differ.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EVALUATION AREA: PROFESSIONAL SKILLS AND KNOWLEDGE

Relevant Project Goals: _____

_____

_____

_____

Strategies Used to Effect Systems Change	Evidence of Change Relative to the Strategies	Supports and Constraints Relative to the Strategies
Development of transition planning manuals/guidelines	Increased presence of transition-related goals and objectives on IEP	Timeliness of materials, Access to target audience
TA delivery system-ongoing support networks	Changes in student school experiences, e.g., increased community-based experiences	Receptiveness of audience, Relevancy of information
Inclusion of transition-related and collaborative curriculum at preservice level across program areas	Increased number of qualified transition personnel in education and adult services	Certification requirements, Relevancy of information
Tuition, release time and/or stipend supports for practitioners	Increased enrollment in transition-related courses and programs	Availability of funds, Qualified applicants
Changes in certification requirements	Increased numbers of transition specialists employed	Political climate, Support of state higher education facility
Inservice trainings-access to ongoing training	Implementation of strategies taught	Professional attendance, Administrative support of trainings
Development of new strategies (local demonstration sites)	Local transition planning that begins earlier than mandated age	Authority to make changes, Number of personnel
Cross-agency training	Participation of adult service agencies at transition planning meetings	Release time, Relevancy of information
Interagency teams (state and local levels)	Integration of student and family plans (IEP, IWRP, IPP, and other individualized plans)	Authority to make decisions, Involvement/commitment of appropriate leadership

This form is only an example of the strategies, evidence of change, and supports and constraints that a state might identify.
It is in no way inclusive.
Each state will have different strategies, corresponding evidence of change, and supports and constraints.
In some cases, the strategies may be the same, but the proof of change and the corresponding supports and constraints will differ.

EVALUATION AREA: AGENCY AND COMMUNITY COLLABORATION

Relevant Project Goals: _____

Strategies Used to Effect Systems Change	Evidence of Change Relative to the Strategies	Supports and Constraints Relative to the Strategies
Development of common referral form	Increased numbers of reciprocal referrals and intakes	Systems for sharing information, Reduction of applicant's time to receipt of services, Too much time to obtain information not relevant to specific agencies
Anticipated needs survey distributed across agencies	Earlier agency participation at IEP meetings	Less time for intake of client service needs Increased case loads
Resource Sharing, e.g., staff time, training, co-funded projects	Reduced duplication of effort, paper, etc Increased services to youth	Authority to make administrative changes, Supportive funding policies
Interagency planning groups (regional and local levels)	Number of relevant stake holders at meetings, introductions of other strategies, e.g., resource sharing Interagency agreements and policies Joint agency oversight of transition outcomes Communication links across and within agencies Increased number of board activities/ decisions	Authority to make decisions, Involvement/commitment of relevant leadership
Involvement of business	Attendance and participation at planning meetings Increased availability of job-sites	Increased job opportunities, Specialized interests
Follow-up/follow-along systems	Systems developed to share data across multiple agencies Joint agency oversight of transition outcomes Changes in agency roles and responsibilities	Compatible hardware systems, Access to data

This form is only an example of the strategies, evidence of change, and supports and constraints that a state might identify.
It is in no way inclusive.
Each state will have different strategies, corresponding evidence of change, and supports and constraints. In some cases, the strategies may be the same, but the proof of change and the corresponding supports and constraints will differ.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix C

Project Director's Interview Protocol

Evaluation Questions
Youth and Family Engagement in Transition

1. At the time the grant was funded, what would you identify as being the areas in need of change in regard to the participation of youth and family in transition services?

2. Have these changed since the grant was funded?

3. Overall, how would you describe the systemic changes you are trying to make in the area of youth and family engagement in transition?

4. What has the project done to increase the involvement of youth and their families in planning and providing effective transition services? Please list all strategies and activities; effective and ineffective. (Probe for: training, invovlement in in local transition planning teams and advisory councils)

5. Which three activities or strategies would you identify as being the most important?

6. Let's talk about __(activity/strategy 1)__ for awhile. What changes have you seen as a result of this activity/strategy?

   Why do you think this activity was one of the most important? (What made this activity/strategy more important than others?)

   What policies, resources, values, or other supports made this a particularly effective activity/strategy in your state?

   What types of policies, resources, values, or other variables made it difficult to implement this activity/strategy in your state?

   Why do you think this activity was effective (or ineffective)?

7. Now, let's talk about __(activity/strategy 2)__ . What changes have you seen as a result of this activity/strategy?

   Why do you think this activity was one of the most important? (What made this activity/strategy more important than others?)

   What policies, resources, values, or other supports made this a particularly effective activity/strategy in your state?

   What types of policies, resources, values, or other variables made it difficult to implement this activity/strategy in your state?

   Why do you think this activity was effective (or ineffective)?

8. Let's talk about __(activity/strategy 3)__ for awhile. What changes have you seen as a result of this activity/strategy?

Why do you think this activity was one of the most important? (What made this activity/strategy more important than others?)

What policies, resources, values, or other supports made this a particularly effective activity/strategy in your state?

What types of policies, resources, values, or other variables made it difficult to implement this activity/strategy in your state?

Why do you think this activity was effective (or ineffective)?

9. What are some of the activities/strategies that you would never try again? Why?

10. What strategies/activities didn't work that you think might work under different circumstances? (Describe strategy/activity and circumstances)?

11. Overall, how would you describe the changes you have made in the area of youth and family participation in transition?

Evaluation Questions
Development of Professional Skills and Knowledge

1. At the time the grant was funded, what would you identify as being the areas in need of change in regard to the level of professional skills and knowledge involving transition services?

2. Have these changed since the grant was funded?

3. Overall, how would you describe the systemic changes you are trying to make in the area of professional skills and knowledge in transition?

4. What has the project done to increase the knowledge and skill levels of those professionals who provide transition services? Please list all strategies and activities; effective and ineffective. (Probe for: training, materials & supplies, involvement in committees, stipends/incentives, university changes, certification changes, funding incentives)

5. Which three would you identify as being the most important?

6. Let's talk about __(activity/strategy 1)__ for awhile. What changes have you seen as a result of this activity/strategy?

   Why do you think this activity was one of the most important? (What made this activity/strategy more important than others?)

   What policies, resources, values, or other supports made this a particularly effective activity/strategy in your state?

   What types of policies, resources, values, or other variables made it difficult to implement this activity/strategy in your state?

   Why do you think this activity was effective (or ineffective)?

7. Now, let's talk about __(activity/strategy 2)__ . What changes have you seen as a result of this activity/strategy?

   Why do you think this activity was one of the most important? (What made this activity/strategy more important than others?)

   What policies, resources, values, or other supports made this a particularly effective activity/strategy in your state?

   What types of policies, resources, values, or other variables made it difficult to implement this activity/strategy in your state?

   Why do you think this activity was effective (or ineffective)?

8. Let's talk about __(activity/strategy 3)__ for awhile. What changes have you seen as a result of this activity/strategy?

   Why do you think this activity was one of the most important? (What made this activity/strategy more important than others?)

   What policies, resources, values, or other supports made this a particularly effective activity/strategy in your state?

   What types of policies, resources, values, or other variables made it difficult to implement this activity/strategy in your state?

   Why do you think this activity was effective (or ineffective)?

9. What are some of the activities/strategies that you would never try again? Why?

10. What strategies/activities didn't work that you think might work under different circumstances? (Describe strategy/activity and circumstances)?

11. Overall, how would you describe the changes you have made in the area of professional skills and knowledge?

Evaluation Questions
Agency and Community Collaboration

1. At the time the grant was funded, what would you identify as being the areas in need of change in regard to the level of agency and community collaboration regarding transition services?

2. Have these changed since the grant was funded?

3. Overall, how would you describe the systemic changes you are trying to make in the area of agency and community collaboration in transition?

4. Which three would you identify as being the most important?

5. Let's talk about _(activity/strategy 1)_ for awhile. What changes have you seen as a result of this activity/strategy?

   Why do you think this activity was one of the most important? (What made this activity/strategy more important than others?)

   What policies, resources, values, or other supports made this a particularly effective activity/strategy in your state?

   What types of policies, resources, values, or other variables made it difficult to implement this activity/strategy in your state?

   Why do you think this activity was effective (or ineffective)?

6. Now, let's talk about _(activity/strategy 2)_. What changes have you seen as a result of this activity/strategy?

   Why do you think this activity was one of the most important? (What made this activity/strategy more important than others?)

   What policies, resources, values, or other supports made this a particularly effective activity/strategy in your state?

   What types of policies, resources, values, or other variables made it difficult to implement this activity/strategy in your state?

   Why do you think this activity was effective (or ineffective)?

7. Let's talk about _(activity/strategy 3)_ for awhile. What changes have you seen as a result of this activity/strategy?

   Why do you think this activity was one of the most important? (What made this activity/strategy more important than others?)

   What policies, resources, values, or other supports made this a particularly effective activity/strategy in your state?

What types of policies, resources, values, or other variables made it difficult to implement this activity/strategy in your state?

Why do you think this activity was effective (or ineffective)?

8. What are some of the activities/strategies that you would never try again? Why?

9. What activities/strategies didn't work that you think might work under different circumstances? (Describe activity/strategy and circumstances.)

10. What resources, if any, have agencies and/or communities shared at the state or local level?

11. Overall, how would you describe the changes you have made in the area of agency and community collaboration?

Appendix D

Sample Project Director Interview

Interview with Lu Van Geldern
Hawaii
Professional Development, Skills, and Knowledge

Coding

DAVID R. JOHNSON: At the time the grant was funded, what would you identify as being the areas in need of change in regard to the level of professional skills and knowledge involving transition services? What were the training needs you saw?

LU VAN GELDERN: The training needs were at the local level. There was quite a bit of training at the district and state level, but very little at the local level.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: What was the content-base of the needs you saw for the parents and professionals who were out there? What did they need to know?

LU VAN GELDERN: For parents, there was just the basic awareness level training. We co-developed training with Aware for parents. For professionals — We have a lot of teachers in Hawaii who aren't trained in special education. They end up bringing in a lot of new people from the mainland who don't know the Hawaii system, and they re-train a lot of regular education teachers in Hawaii. So we have a lot of people teaching in Hawaii who are local and who have just barely begun to learn special education, although, as for transition itself, there was very little training.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: When you look at the types of skills that you started with, have these training needs changed since the grant was funded? With the professionals now, what are the types of courses or programs, what content was expressed earlier, and how is that different today? What are the skills evolving to? Was it general awareness training to begin with?

LU VAN GELDERN: What we did with the grant was that we went into the sites that were identified and did a full year of training. I think that's the reason it was so effective — it was a long-term commitment; it was thorough. I think there was a lot of one-shot training without any follow-up or technical assistance following the training. What we did initially with the training was to develop teams, and train them on group processes, and then "best practices." Then they chose from an array of "best practices" for the kinds of things they would look at. Up to two years ago, the transition teachers were doing all of the transition planning, and the special education teachers who weren't transition teachers were just doing regular IEPs. So two years ago there was a real shift, with all of the special education teachers needing to do transition planning. It was somebody else's responsibility; they didn't have to know about it or even do it. That

was the time when we started to come in with the classes. There was a lot of need for talking about the IEP process and how it's driven by transition planning, rather than just an add-on piece. That also then gets into assessment. I think assessment is still a need, but the kinds of things we've done training on are IEP processes, postsecondary options, self-determination, assistive technology, working with students with behavior problems. It's differed from site to site, but there've been general things like those.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: What do you view as the current needs that are yet unmet in terms of knowledge for your professionals?

LU VAN GELDERN: For the people that we've already trained — One of the problems here is that we keep getting new people in, especially if people come in from the mainland. You train them, and they move out, and then you get new people back in. In some schools, there is up to a 50% turnover in new mainland teaching staff. This is a real problem.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: So you keep repeating the training.

LU VAN GELDERN: Yes. The Fair Labor Standards Act is another thing that we've done training on. There was not a lot of knowledge on it, in the beginning. What we've put in place is a lot more communication among the departments, so that people can share their expertise, which probably is the best thing for Hawaii, since we're always going to have this geographical problem.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: How about teaming training? I suppose that's all part of it, an underlying base in all of this interdisciplinary team development.

LU VAN GELDERN: Yes, a solid part. When I first started, we went with the model the University had used that was so heavy on team process training. We used a lot of that material, and it was very effective. My concern then, coming into the situation and looking at it, was that once you get the team processes and the team development, you need to get into heavy content. The process and the content needed to be balanced. I think we've done that.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: Overall, how would you describe the systemic changes you are trying to make in the area of professional skills and knowledge in transition?

LU VAN GELDERN: In terms of what we've done on the grant, through the Department of Education, training is totally different from what it was in the past. It's ongoing, long-term, university-level, graduate-level credit. Before, it was short-term workshops that gave credit

through the department. The other thing is to develop networks of people so that when people come in who aren't trained, there are other people who can share their expertise. It's fundamentally an empowerment approach at the local level, as well.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: Is the University in Hawaii beginning to address this need for more training for new teachers, or is it looked at as something that has to be addressed to the people who are already in the ranks?

LU VAN GELDERN: You mean the new people just out of college?

DAVID R. JOHNSON: Yes, the preservice training programs for special education and rehabilitation. Are they tying content on transition in? I know the University of Hawaii probably does in terms of special education.

LU VAN GELDERN: Yes. There's a new grant through the University to train transition specialists. But the Special Education Department doesn't have a requirement that they have a specific course in transition. I think it's pretty minimal.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: In terms of the state interagency policy perspective, is their objective to try to work with the higher education institutions to prepare future teachers in transition? Is that something that's been discussed, and is it a higher priority?

LU VAN GELDERN: It hasn't been, but it should be.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: What has the project done to increase the knowledge and skill levels of those professionals who provide transition services? — please list all strategies and activities, effective and ineffective. Assess training materials and supplies, involvement in committees, stipends, incentives, university certification changes, funding incentives. It has to do with the question of how has the project supported professionals as they attempt to access and receive training. You talked about stipends.

LU VAN GELDERN: We've brought a lot of other agency service providers into training that already exists. For instance, last year we brought vocational rehabilitation counselors into Pac-Rim. This year they're here on their own. Last year was the first time they had come. I think we brought in 40 people last year through the grant. This year we didn't pay for anybody to come, and I notice a lot of them here today. And, as I mentioned before, the Postsecondary Conference included a lot of vocational rehabilitation counselors, Department of Labor people, Department of Education people, not just community college people. So I think we've had an impact on cross-training

beyond the classes.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: The incentive present here, also, was doing it for credit, which allowed people to make lane-changes and earn credits toward degrees.

LU VAN GELDERN: We also got state support from Vocational Rehabilitation that the summer classes would count as comp time. That was a policy change.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: Do you think the fact that training was offered locally on sites helped?

LU VAN GELDERN: Absolutely. That was a real change. I don't know of many university classes that are offered on the outer islands. By taking those to the sites, we got a lot more participation, follow-up, and local control.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: How are the courses that are taught out in the field differ from those that people would encounter? I suppose they're more interactive.

LU VAN GELDERN: The main difference is that they chose their own content. If they had come in to Oahu it would have been different content. They chose content based on their local needs.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: So the courses were tailored to their needs.

LU VAN GELDERN: Right. The other thing that's different about those classes is that we have 8-hour classes on Saturdays, and half the day is spent in team meetings. During the team-meeting portion of the class, they're actually carrying out their action plans, all related to transition.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: Which three could you identify as being the most important?

LU VAN GELDERN: The first thing I would mention would be the team training at the sites. Second, the training that we did for the district Interagency Transition Committees. We trained them on team processes and brought them in to organize them. Third would be the Postsecondary Conference.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: Let's talk about the team training first. What changes have you seen as a result of this training?

LU VAN GELDERN: I've seen a lot more communication between regular education and special education, and between agencies. I've

also seen improved planning for students, based on some IEPs I've observed. The action plans that they've carried out have amazed me. For instance, the Maui group developed a whole district network to tie the transition center to the other schools.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: One thing that would be helpful to establish the context of this would be for you to describe the team training, in terms of how it's organized.

LU VAN GELDERN: In each case it started out about four months before the classes started. We would go into the schools and talk to the principal and the transition teacher and the transition district coordinator about coming to the site and offering the classes as well as a part-time teacher. Then we would also get support from the district superintendent. We would go in and explain what we were doing and explain that our purpose was to improve outcomes for special needs students, and that as part of that we would have university-level classes and work with them on the content that they chose. They seemed to be very open to that, because they knew it would be based on their needs. We asked for participation from regular education, special education, administration, other agencies, parents, and students.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: Why do you think this activity was one of the most important? What made it more important than others?

LU VAN GELDERN: The local level is where the most change can occur, because it's a bottom-up approach, an empowering approach.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: What policies, resources, values, or other supports made this a particularly effective activity in Hawaii?

LU VAN GELDERN: The fact that we offered graduate-level university credit and paid for the tuition and brought in expertise that was reliable.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: Was there state agency support for people to go into training? You mentioned the VR counselors. So in some cases it took communication with the field people?

LU VAN GELDERN: Right. Through the state ITPC we got support from Vocational Rehabilitation and the Department of Labor.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: How about special education teachers, was that driven from the local level, or was it a state-supported arrangement?

LU VAN GELDERN: From the local level. It was very much —

DAVID R. JOHNSON: Self-selected?

LU VAN GELDERN: Yes.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: Are any other positive values associated with the training?

LU VAN GELDERN: Another value that we nurtured was the value of collaboration and communication, because the classes are taught as teams. We've had some people who were resistant to the idea of inclusion. In this forum, they seemed to be open to talk about their views. I've watched people do some turn-arounds in their values. For instance, there was a long conversation at the Kohala meeting a couple of months ago, when we were talking about students who had been maltreated and working with them. They asked: Are we here to teach content, or are we here to teach students? I didn't handle that question; the group handled it. They talked about the fact that if you don't meet the needs of the student, you can't teach the student. We also talked about using content to meet some of the emotional needs of students. Without that, the person arguing would never have changed her opinions about the group.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: What types of policies, resources, values, or other variables made it difficult to implement this activity or strategy in Hawaii?

LU VAN GELDERN: It's been difficult to do the University classes through the Department of Education. Some of the things that we do on the grant don't fit the norm of what the Department of Education usually does: for instance, paying the tuition, or paying per diems. Last year we brought the four teams together from Maui and Oahu. Some of those things have been difficult that have been necessary for us to do in collaboration and networking.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: How did you overcome those difficulties? Did you basically work them through internally?

LU VAN GELDERN: Right. They were a part of the grant budget, and they'd been approved. I just worked through them.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: Do you think that without the external funds, the tuition supports, you would have this type of participation?

LU VAN GELDERN: No, not at all.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: Any other difficulties or implementation problems in regard to the team training?

LU VAN GELDERN: The protocol has been difficult, because, in some cases, we were blocked at the district level from going into some of the sites. We had good cooperation from the district transition coordinators, and they worked through that, but the protocol was incredible.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: Let's talk a bit about the ITPC training. What changes have you seen as a result of this activity?

LU VAN GELDERN: The people who are brought in and taught team processes have ongoing ITPCs, where they didn't before. I think there had been some attempts at the district level to have some interagency meetings, but without the kind of forum that we provided, I don't think it would have happened. We not only brought them together, but showed them how to organize and supported them as they started. We're in the second year of that now.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: What is the organization of that? — how it got started, what it looks like now, who participates.

LU VAN GELDERN: We brought in 200 people from the state in September 1993. The agencies identified the key people who should be invited. Then we sent overall transition training and had a panel of consumers who talked about positive outcomes through interagency collaboration. Then we walked them through a team development process: setting up a mission statement, action planning, ground rules, membership. It was a little different from the teams. It was similar to what we did with the teams, but it was an abbreviated version. When they started to meet on their own, a lot of them used the same processes. A lot of them go back to their mission statement at every meeting they have.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: Why do you think this training activity was one of the most important? What made it more important than others?

LU VAN GELDERN: It was definitely something that had been missing here. We didn't have anything at the district level, which is where a lot of the policies become defined as procedures and are operationalized. Without that piece, there was some training at the local level, and a lot of training at the state level, but a lot of the service providers really didn't have an ongoing mechanism for training on communication and collaboration.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: What policies, resources, values, or other supports made this a particularly effective type of training?

LU VAN GELDERN: All the agencies had been directed by the state level or by the national level, or by regulations, to work with other

agencies. The reality of what's going on made it imperative that they work together. I think they were ready to meet. They just needed an outside mechanism to get them together.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: The resources, again, were tied into the project resources. What about values in this case? Were there shifts in values?

LU VAN GELDERN: I think all of them had to give up some of their power, maybe. I don't know. When you start to collaborate like that, you have to value collaborating and the end product more than you do your particular jobs. I think that's changed some.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: What types of policies, resources, values, or other variables made it difficult to implement this training in Hawaii?

LU VAN GELDERN: I think it was difficult for a lot of people to see that transition was more than just a Department of Education problem, and more than something that occurred as a student left school. There was compartmentalized thinking, for instance, at the Department of Health. I remember a conversation at the Kuai ITPC with someone who said, "Well, transition certainly ends as soon as they're out of DOE, doesn't it?" And community colleges were the same way, feeling that the DOE takes care of these kids till they're 20, so they weren't their responsibility until they were 20. That made it difficult, because people felt more comfortable when they felt that they had a well-defined, compartmentalized job. They had to give that up to talk about problem solving for everyone.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: Any other difficulties?

LU VAN GELDERN: There was a difficulty on one island, when the special education person didn't want an interagency group to start. I think he felt threatened that we might come up with some ideas that weren't his. We had some blocking there.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: What changed his mind?

LU VAN GELDERN: He left.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: Why do you think this training was effective?

LU VAN GELDERN: Because we tried to empower local people and meet their needs, instead of prescribing what they were going to do. We just helped them get together and organize, then tried to provide resources for them. It's always something I'm concerned about that wasn't based on the grant. In the beginning, when they first started to meet, they wanted reports on the grant, which was fine, but we're

at the point now where those organizations will go on without us. It's just that they know we helped get them together, but they're not grant advisories there, they're service advisories.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: Let's move on to asking about some of the specifics of the third type of training, or professional development activity dealing with postsecondary options. What changes have you seen as a result of this activity?

LU VAN GELDERN: I talked a little about that yesterday, in terms of the changes within the system. Should I add more?

DAVID R. JOHNSON: Yes, restate it, please.

LU VAN GELDERN: It only happened in September, so I probably can't answer that too well. I think that down the road I'll see more changes. We need to get some good hard data on how many special education status students are actually attending community colleges and succeeding. The problem is, they don't self-identify. Often, we have students there, and the community college doesn't even recognize them as special education kids. I've heard estimates in the past of numbers not succeeding as high as 95%, but they're just estimates. The bottom line is that we hope we've have more students succeed at the community college level.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: Why do you think this training activity is one of the most important?

LU VAN GELDERN: It was organized within the community college system and supported by the grant. They tailor-made it to what they needed, but they also did cross-training so that they included other populations. I think that's why it was successful.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: So they took some ownership for the training.

LU VAN GELDERN: Right.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: What policies, resources, values, or other supports made this effective?

LU VAN GELDERN: We had support from all of the agencies at the state level so they were released from their jobs. And of course the costs were supported through the grant.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: What made it difficult to implement this training?

LU VAN GELDERN: I don't remember having difficulties.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: Why do you think this activity was effective?

LU VAN GELDERN: Because they knew that this was a real issue. 504 and ADA were in the forefront, and I think they wanted training on it. Also, our speaker was from their system, and that helped make if effective. It was one of their people talking to them.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: What would you never try again in the area of professional development and training? What didn't work or seemed to have insurmountable obstacles?

LU VAN GELDERN: I can't think of anything. The grant was well written and on-target.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: What activities or strategies didn't work that you think might work under different circumstances or conditions? Your answer to the one before covers that. The last question is: Overall, how would you describe the changes that have been made in the area of development of professional skills or knowledge?

LU VAN GELDERN: We've empowered local people to help prescribe their own training, and we've gone from short-term training to long-term training in centralized sites.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: Describe the training that parents and students receive.

LU VAN GELDERN: The only separate parent training we've done is the training that we did in conjunction with AWARE, which was a positive collaborative approach. Again, a problem we had with it was that for it to be sponsored by the Department of Education, we had to go into the districts and give the training, and we haven't gotten to all the districts with that training yet. The students have been involved in what the teams are doing in re-writing some curricula and trying to get the IEPs to be driven by the transition goals, which changes all of their goals and, we hope, the curriculum. A lot of the teams are moving toward inclusion as part of their action plans. We haven't yet done separate training for the students. We should.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: Maybe one type of indirect training would be if teachers have learned or developed self-determination understandings and take those principles and concepts back with them.

LU VAN GELDERN: Another thing we've done is that we've taught the teams self-determination curriculum to use with students, so that's been implemented in the schools. Another thing that we did was to sponsor having Jane Jerrow, the Executive Director of the American Higher Education Association for Disabilities, here for a week. In

addition to doing the two-day workshop, she spent a full day at Maui Community College meeting with secondary and community college people talking about ADA and 504, and how to make accommodations. She was planning to go to Hilo to spend a day, but was rained out. She made a videotape of the Maui presentation, however, which was shared with Hilo. She also went to University of Hawaii at Manilla and worked with the disabilities group there, bringing in people from several departments, including the School of Medicine, and talking about the accommodations that needed to be made for students at the University with disabilities.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: I think that concludes this part on professional development and training.

Interview with Lu Van Geldern
Hawaii
Youth and Family Engagement in Transition

Coding

DAVID R. JOHNSON: At the time the grant was funded, what would you identify as being the areas in need of change in regard to the participation of youth and families in transition services in Hawaii?

LU VAN GELDERN: One of the problems is that there wasn't any really good parent training on transition. There were some isolated efforts. Another concern is encouraging the students themselves to participate more their IEPs and transition planning.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: What is your Parent Center like in Hawaii, in terms of helping to support some of the transition activities?

LU VAN GELDERN: I think they've been very active. There's a Spin at work that's been active in training, and also Aware and LBH. One of the things they've done is to develop a parent-professional university-level class through the UAP. I participated in that class last spring, did a lot of training and some needs assessment, and got some suggestions on them and how to involve parents more in how to do training.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: Have things changed since the grant was funded?

LU VAN GELDERN: The only real change was the fact that we did co-training with Aware. Also, I think student participation has improved in IEPs, but don't have enough data to be sure.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: Is there state support in terms of participation of students in transition? Are the local programs fully aware of current transition service requirements?

LU VAN GELDERN: I think that local people are aware of the fact that the student needs to be at his or her IEP meeting. I think the special education teachers have been involving the students in some long-range planning, but I don't think those two have come together as much as they should. In two weeks the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Services is going to be monitoring two areas of participation — not just that the student was there, but that the student had an impact on the plan, and, also, if the student's not there, some documentation explaining why. Those are a couple of the things that we're starting to talk with the teachers and the district coordinators about now. It goes beyond just having the student there.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: How do you view family participation in transition planning or IEP planning for students in Hawaii? Has it been fairly consistent?

LU VAN GELDERN: No, I think part of it is that the IEP process here is fairly cut and dried. It's more product than process. We're trying to move more toward having it be a team meeting, where everyone has equal voices. What we've done in training the classes is to share the Life-Planning Process, which is a Colorado model that really involves the students and the parents as equal participants.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: Overall, how would you describe the systemic changes you are trying to make in the area of youth and family engagement in transition?

LU VAN GELDERN: That's an area we need to work on. We've basically just started.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: What are some of the things you'd like to work on, then, that need to be accomplished?

LU VAN GELDERN: There have been a couple of in-roads made. We started an annual Parent Night, both in Maui and at Castle High School, two of the initial sites, where they brought in other agencies and parents and students and had dialogue about services and transition planning. What I'd like to see is a systematic way of including parents and students in the IEP planning.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: What has the project done to increase the involvement of youth and families in planning and providing effective transition services? — list all strategies and activities, effective and ineffective.

LU VAN GELDERN: We have parents on all the district ITPCs. We've invited parents to the teams at the sites, and we have two teams that have parents on them. Some of them have invited parents in. Some parents have come part of the time, but have not stayed in. We did the co-training with Aware and presented that both in the Honolulu and Hawaii districts. We co-taught a class on professional and parent transition planning.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: Which three activities or strategies would you identify as being the most important?

LU VAN GELDERN: The co-training at the Parent Nights, and the inclusion of parents as stakeholders in the major organizations.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: Is there a third?

LU VAN GELDERN: The inclusion of parents in the IEP process, making it a process rather than a product.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: Which of the three would come first in importance?

LU VAN GELDERN: Inclusion of parents as stakeholders.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: What changes have you seen as a result of this strategy?

LU VAN GELDERN: I think we have a different perspective. When the Advisory Board was proposed in the grant, we didn't have a parent on the Advisory Board, so we added a parent. We get so much into the things we're doing that even though we know that the student is the most important, and we know the families are important, without a stakeholder at each of the organizations making the decisions, we tend to forget to keep that perspective in mind. We also have two parents on the state ITPC, and we have parents on all of the district ITPCs. They're good about giving us a reality check.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: Why do you think this activity was one of the most important strategies?

LU VAN GELDERN: Without them there to talk about their viewpoint, it's easy to get side-tracked into "professionalism."

DAVID R. JOHNSON: What policies, resources, values, or other supports made this a particularly effective strategy?

LU VAN GELDERN: I think everyone's aware that parents need to be included. Oh, another thing that's happened is that we have professionals who happen to be parent advocates who are active on the grant. Two of our initial four part-time teachers were parent advocates, and one of them will soon be full-time on the grant. So I think to get a professional with a parent advocacy background is good.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: What types of resources have been used to promote their participation?

LU VAN GELDERN: The organizations that have been most active in this are Aware, Spin, and LDAH.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: What types of policies, resources, values, or other variables have made it difficult to implement this strategy?

LU VAN GELDERN: The most difficult is that one parent cannot speak

for all parents. You tend to get the same people who take part in most of the major activities, and you get just the views of those few. They can't speak for all disabilities and all concerns.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: Are there other difficulties in terms of parent involvement?

LU VAN GELDERN: The University credit isn't an incentive to parents to take part on the teams in most cases. Also, our agendas turn to be school-oriented, and maybe get a bit boring for parents. I think those two factors have caused problems.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: Have you used particular strategies to overcome that dilemma?

LU VAN GELDERN: If we get to the place where we should be, of having enough parents who feel comfortable taking part and helping to change the agenda, the problem will be gone. I don't think it'll change until we get to that point.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: Do you feel that parent participation is valued at the state level, in the ITPC, and at the local level?

LU VAN GELDERN: I think it is, but I think both have the problem of using the same people too much. We have a handful of parents who take part in all of the activities.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: What made this activity particularly effective?

LU VAN GELDERN: The fact that they bring their perspective to the forefront. They need to be in from the beginning on the planning.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: Let's talk a bit about the co-training at the Parent Nights. What changes have you seen as a result of this activity?

LU VAN GELDERN: The co-training has gone beyond the Parent Nights, too. We've always included parents at the postsecondary conference, the conference we had on the organization of the district ITPCs. Any training we have, we've invited parents in. The difference it's made is that it changes the thrust of the training, and makes their concerns known. To train parents at the same time you train professionals really puts them on a level with the professionals. They have the same knowledge.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: Why do you think this activity was one of the most important?

LU VAN GELDERN: If everybody hears the same message and gets the same training, then the way it's carried out becomes different. It keeps parents in the forefront of people's minds, if you have them at the training and in the groups.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: What policies, resources, values, or other supports made this a particularly effective strategy?

LU VAN GELDERN: Being able to use the grant funds across agencies and across groups helped. It's not all within one agency. Another thing is networking with everyone and making sure they know that parents need to be included anytime we have training.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: Anything else?

LU VAN GELDERN: We have some very active parents, who are willing to put in the time to do the training. Having the professionals on the grant who are parents helps, too.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: What types of policies, resources, values, or other supports made it difficult to implement this training in Hawaii?

LU VAN GELDERN: We tend to have a narrow view when we talk about including parents. We have a narrow view of which parents to include, and we see the same people over and over, with no change in viewpoints. We need to broaden the focus of inclusion to mean including all parents.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: Why do you think this activity was effective?

LU VAN GELDERN: I think I answered that already.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: Let's talk about the inclusion of parents in the IEP process. What changes have you seen as a result of this activity?

LU VAN GELDERN: This is more of an attitudinal change, at this point. It's fairly new, and it's a change in thinking for a lot of the professionals. I haven't seen a lot of change yet.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: Why do you think this activity is one of the most important?

LU VAN GELDERN: In the individualized planning for students, the parent needs to be more involved. What we've noticed in monitoring the IEPs in the state is a fairly cut-and-dried process that is not necessarily based on outcomes for kids. You don't see much evidence of family planning, and I think we need to move in that direction. What we've done so far is training and awareness, but we

need to follow it into practice and see what changes are made.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: What policies, resources, values, or other supports made or would make this a particularly effective strategy?

LU VAN GELDERN: For one thing, it's federal law that the parents be included. We'll probably get some support on that from the federal monitoring. I think everyone would say that parent and student input are valuable. But people get used to doing things in a certain way, and don't think about how to change.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: Part of the responsibilities of the state systems change projects is to ensure that the transition service requirements are implemented. Do you think that there is full awareness at the local level of the requirements for parents to be notified?

LU VAN GELDERN: Oh, yes. The basics are in place. The change that's needed is having the parents and students be an integral part of the IEP process. We're used to notifying them and making sure they're there and changing the date and the time to accommodate, and all that, but one thing about Hawaii is that the IEP process itself is pretty cut-and-dried. It needs to be more of a planning process. That's what will involve parents a lot more.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: Do you think any particular resources need to be committed to this?

LU VAN GELDERN: Training. Another thing that Hawaii is behind on is efficacy training. Part of it is the culture. They're used to sitting back quietly and saying, "You know best." It's different from some of the other states I've been in. Parents training other parents on how to be advocates for their students in the IEP process will move it faster than anything else.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: What sorts of policies, resources, values, or other variables made or would make it difficult to implement this strategy?

LU VAN GELDERN: We're driven more by lawsuits and hearings and those kinds of things. There are real fears in Hawaii of doing the wrong thing at the state level. I feel it's zeroed in on the IEP process. For instance, in other states I've been in, it's common to do a narrative of the discussions. In Hawaii the IEP is looked on more as a contract: if you put things down in the IEP, they must be done. There's not a real move to look at needs and to look at the process of the conversations. It's more like a contract. That tends to make the process dry, also. There's one IEP form for the whole state. In Colorado, we each developed our own forms and were free to do that.

The form for transition planning was totally different from the one for regular process. They had a good process for transition planning that was outside of the IEP. They went away from it, because it started to look like a contract, and they were concerned. There's a real concern that if things are put down in the IEP they'll be called into due process.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: Why do you think this activity was effective?

LU VAN GELDERN: It's hard to say that, because it hasn't been effective yet. It's something new that we're working on. We'll need to look down the road at how effective it's been.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: What activities or strategies would you never try again? That may be irrelevant here.

LU VAN GELDERN: Right. The entire area needs to be worked on. It needs to be stressed in the grant in the next two and a half years.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: Activities or strategies that didn't work that you think might work under different circumstances or conditions would also be irrelevant, then. Overall, how would you describe the changes that have been made in the area of youth and family participation in transition? You commented already that it's an area of development that needs to be targeted in the next two and a half years.

LU VAN GELDERN: We've have some impact, but we need to stress it.

Interview with Lu Van Geldern
Hawaii
Interagency Collaboration Issues

Coding

DAVID R. JOHNSON: At the time the grant was funded, what would you identify as being the areas in need of change in regard to level of agency and community collaboration regarding transition services?

LU VAN GELDERN: When the grant started, there really weren't any local or district interagency groups. There was good collaboration at the state level, but I think it was really lacking at the local level.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: Have things changed since the grant was funded?

LU VAN GELDERN: Yes, the grant set up the district Interagency Transition Planning Committees in all seven districts. We organized them in September of 1993, and they're all going strong.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: This relates to the last response: Overall, how would you describe the systemic changes you are trying to make in the area of agency and community collaboration in transition? First, maybe we could identify some of the targets of change that you've been looking at and working on with your interagency groups.

LU VAN GELDERN: I think each of the districts is going in a little different direction. One of the concerns I had in the beginning was being very clear on the fact that it was our job within the grant to organize these teams, but not have them be dependent on the grant. I think a systemic change I've seen is that I feel they are independent and will go on, on their own, if they're not tied just to the grant. I think in Hawaii, as in a lot of states, it's more at a procedures level at the district level. I think what they hadn't done very much was to sit down at the table and talk to each other about how to make policies work at the local level, on a procedural level. It depends on each district, but each of them is trying to iron out what impact they will have locally. For instance, the order of selection vocational rehabilitation has put into place. It's like saying, "Yes, that's the policy we have at the state level, but what does that really mean in Kuai?" I think the change is that they're getting together and working those things out within their own groups.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: Some of these groups were partially in existence, weren't they, through other grant funds, to begin with?

LU VAN GELDERN: Not at the district level. We had a state interagency committee and school-site teams already operating.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: So the project itself stimulated the development of these district-level groups?

LU VAN GELDERN: Yes. In the beginning, all they did was to talk about what each of them did. It was mostly awareness of what each of them did. Now they're getting much more into where the gaps and needs are and how to fill in the gaps, and the kinds of things they need to do. Hawaii does not have a major problem as far as sharing and common forms go. Most of these people know each other. It was more a question of needing to have them be systematic about what the services are and where gaps exist.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: So this grass-roots development represents a major outcome of the project in terms of the focus for systems change, while support at the state level is one of local design.

LU VAN GELDERN: Right.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: Across all these groups, how many people are actively involved in the state in your district-level teams?

LU VAN GELDERN: It's about 20 per group, so probably 150-200 people.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: What has the project done to promote agency and community collaboration in regard to transition services? — please list all strategies and activities, effective and ineffective. What's been improved, what's been worked on, by these teams?

LU VAN GELDERN: One of the things we've tried to do is some common cross-training for different groups. For instance, we brought the vocational rehabilitation people into Pac-Rim last year. That was the first time they had come into Pac-Rim, and I notice they're here on their own this year. So part of it was establishing common calendars, common training, communicating with each other, because there were so many separate things going on. You know, one of the things we need to be working on is memorandums of agreement between agencies. We have this huge $6 million mental health lawsuit that was just settled, and agencies are leery right now of memorandums of agreement, because that was based on a memorandum of agreement that wasn't being followed. It seems that it's more effective here to be sure that people are meeting on a regular basis with a focus, so that they keep talking and working on things together locally.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: At the district-level?

LU VAN GELDERN: Yes. I feel we still need to do that. So what we looked at was organizational. We looked at the common training, and we looked at common calendars, too.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: Given the current context, with the nervousness state agencies feel, do you think that the district teams feel generally supported by the state agencies for what they do?

LU VAN GELDERN: Yes, I think so. It was confusing in the beginning. The state interagency group was so large that it got to the point where it had a lot of district people and even some local people in it. It wasn't a policy-making group anymore. Then, when we started the interagency groups at the district level, they got confused about the school teams. It was always set up that the school teams would be practice, and the district teams would be procedures, and the state team would be policy. What we've done now this past week is to re-organize the state so that it really is just interagency directors, and then the district people. So that's what we need to do, and then we need to get the flow between the three.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: So the school teams continue to meet to determine best practices?

LU VAN GELDERN: Right. And then they report back to the district. That system is pretty good. But we need a systematic way to do that, and we're working on it now.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: Besides promoting this climate for change in these interagency groups and the like at the district level, what else has collaboration influenced positively? What are some other accomplishments that these agencies, either the community agencies or the state groups, have brought about?

LU VAN GELDERN: A specific list?

DAVID R. JOHNSON: Yes. Let's start at the state level. Since the inception of the project, I know there was a period when the state team went in different directions. It maybe wasn't as potent as it should have been, or as clear in its mission. But still, through that, their presence in the state was likely to have had some impact on the state during the time of the project. Can you describe that a little?

LU VAN GELDERN: They had to write the grant. What happened in the beginning was that the state ITPC became focused too much on the grant. It was oriented on the Department of Education and on the grant, and the grant is only to encourage them to improve the system. What we needed to do was to re-organize the state so that the group was just directors and looked just at state and local policies. One of the comments that was made last week by the person from vocational rehabilitation was that they got together to develop the ITP, the planning process for school-aged children, and now that they've done that, they don't need to meet. So part of it is just getting them to look at the whole picture of all the things that need to be done for transition, because they don't see the order of selection, for instance, or other things that are coming from the national. That's something that they need to look at to develop into state policies.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: So the state ITPC really is assessing, in a mutual or collective way, the federal-to-state relationship and its impact on policy. They're also conducting various types of needs assessments through their own logical way of looking at what it is we need to do in Hawaii. And other things. But they're doing needs assessments and other ways of assessing the impact.

LU VAN GELDERN: And then we need to share the "best practices" from the district levels to the state ITPC and to translate those into policy.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: It's a bottom-up as well as top-down kind of input into the collaborative process?

LU VAN GELDERN: The idea was to go both directions.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: Who's in the middle?

LU VAN GELDERN: The districts.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: I suppose a lot of your training is thought through and is based on different types of collaborative work occurring at the district level. Could you comment on this?

LU VAN GELDERN: A lot of the needs come up from the district ITPCs. Let me think of an example. The Kauai ITPC requested parent training for transition. As a result of that, we worked with the local parent group Aware and developed a 3-hour module for parent training that was collaboratively done between Aware and the Department of Education. That was a direct result of a request from one of the ITPCs. Then it was given statewide. Things like that have been very positive.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: The participants in the training have been fairly diverse — who are some of the participants?

LU VAN GELDERN: Professionals and parents are typically involved. For example, we had a postsecondary conference in September. That, of course, developed from the realization that there were a lot of professionals at the community college level who really didn't know some of the implications of 504 and the Americans with Disabilities Act, or even, once they did, how to make the modifications. It was a 2-day conference on both what their responsibility was and on how to meet it. At that conference, we had 160 participants. We had about 60 people from community college, we had 30-40 vocational rehabilitation counselors, we had about 30 Department of Education people, and then we had parents and other community members. That was a direct result of the fact that we're all working together. Before, they might have had a conference with only community college people.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: Have there been any specific policy changes since the time of the grant here? I know that Hawaii has several supporting policy initiatives to make transition happen. Anything recent?

LU VAN GELDERN: Right at the start of the grant, the ITP was incorporated into the IEP. Of course, in the Policies and Procedures Handbook that we're writing, we're emphasizing the idea that the IEPs should be driven by the transition plan, rather than the other way around. There's a whole move in that direction.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: Was it just special education that determined that, or was that particular policy change, to incorporate the ITP within the IEP, discussed on more of a collaborative interagency basis?

LU VAN GELDERN: I think it was discussed at the state ITPC. It was part of the need. Also, the community colleges have developed one form. They used to have different forms for community college. They've developed one form that's shared between the colleges. That makes things a lot easier. I'd need to think more before I listed more. I'm sure that there are other things.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: Yes. And I'll give you a chance to look at this list of questions later, too.

LU VAN GELDERN: There are other things that are more at the procedures level. For instance, we moved the annual state special education conference to be held in conjunction with the grant. This has also promoted the importance of working together. I guess there are a lot of practices that have changed. I'm not sure if policies have so much.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: Any organizational changes?

LU VAN GELDERN: What's hard, David, is that there are a lot of things that are going on that you can't attribute just to the grant that are happening that maybe you're a part of. That's where it's hard to pull examples out. For instance, the Office of Instructional Services within the state Department of Education has been totally re-structured, and Special Education now is part of the whole picture. It's not segregated anymore. There are so many things happening that are in line with what we need to have happen. It's all moving in a positive direction, and the grant has helped this.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: Could you identify maybe three of the major things that have happened out of collaboration? — three that you would identify as being the most important. What are the three most important ways that collaboration has benefitted Hawaii and its students and families?

LU VAN GELDERN: Anything, you mean, not necessarily policy? One of the major things that has happened is in the community college system. Now there really is a network of people who assist kids with disabilities. They meet together, and we have a lot of trained people for them to network with, at the colleges.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: How does that collaboration look at the community level? Does secondary special education communicate better now? Who's involved in that collaboration? I know that the general notion of collaboration and cooperation at the community colleges is central, but does that mean that they are engaged more with more kinds of community collaborative planning through the district teams, or what's happened?

LU VAN GELDERN: A lot of people know who to call now. That's one of the major changes. Before they weren't even sure who to talk to or what people did. That whole system has made a major shift through the grant.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: I suppose just generally it elevates professional expectations for kids with disabilities in those systems.

LU VAN GELDERN: Yes. Another is that the school teams have had a major impact. We had four teams last year, and we have 10 teams this year. This year we have about 100 people taking part on those teams, where last year we had about 50. Those people have spread out into other networks, too. You know, in the fifth year of the grant we were supposed to pull in the schools that didn't have the Department of Labor transition centers and start to network with them. That actually has happened in the first two districts that we started in, at the first four sites. There's a network in Windward where they've used grant funds to — They have a computer system that hooks Career-kakua, which is the job-finding network for Hawaii, to all the schools. Maui has networked all of the schools into the transition center at Maui High School, and they present workshops there that are broadcast on Lenai-Molokai-Tehana. That's a major change that happened through the grant. People stopped being so isolated in this area and started to look at the whole system. In the spring of last year, when we were working with the four sites, we started talking to them about all the things that happened with transition in assessment, counseling, classes, and so forth. When they started out, they were all very insular, looking at all the things that didn't happen. When they looked at the whole picture and started to see how everybody fit in, they realized that the whole picture was pretty good. They also looked at duplication of services. Systems changes have come a long way through the grant. Let me think of another one. Oh, the Department of Labor has made a major shift through the grant. I think the connection between the transition coordinators with Department of Labor and the special education transition teachers has strengthened. At all the schools we've worked with, they have a strong connection that they didn't have before. Now special education teachers are being included in the Department of Labor training and vice versa.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: Let's take a look at the first strategy here, the involvement of the community colleges in terms of this. Let me ask you several questions. What changes have you seen as a result of this activity? You mentioned a few before, but perhaps for this question we could get a bit more specific.

LU VAN GELDERN: As a result of working with the community colleges?

DAVID R. JOHNSON: Yes. What's working that wasn't working before? What's showing up as important outcomes for them? Going from low participation to high participation, maybe, or the offering of new or special programs.

LU VAN GELDERN: We need some good hard data on that. What I see in place now that I didn't see before is a system of people who can get services for the kids. The Employment Training Center has someone on the grant who has now become an advocate across the community college system for the kids. They are able to network within the system. For instance, we had some reports from one of the schools on the big island that the kids were having difficulty at the Hilo community college, and we could talk to our person on the grant who's with community colleges, and he can go and try to help. We usually see results from that, because they know all the people to talk to now. Another change that's occurred is in the delivery of services. We were finding that a lot of our students couldn't enter training programs at community colleges, so we started a pilot program last summer for short-term training with no entry-level requirements. It was very successful. We had 15 students in a fashion technology course, and 14 of the students completed it. Next summer we're planning four of those classes. The system is starting to look at that. Vocational rehabilitation and the community colleges are starting to make some agreements on doing similar programs after school. The Department of Education really took notice. The systems are starting to look at that and see that the two-year programs with entry-level requirements aren't the only choice.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: Out of all the things that the systems change grant could have an impact on, why is it so important that community colleges have made this move?

LU VAN GELDERN: Because it gives them something between getting out of school and either not having a job or having a minimum wage job and going to a community college for a two-year program. There wasn't anything in between. There was a huge gap, because we don't have vocational schools here, for students who needed to improve their skill levels before going to work. Also, many of our students can succeed at the community colleges. And two other things that have happened through the community colleges. Because of the grant, there is now a full-time position funded by them to serve kids with special needs statewide. And there is also a policy handbook for serving people with disabilities that includes a lot of recommendations on procedures and accommodations. Those are two things that developed through the grant.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: This has several different meanings, but, in relation to collaboration with the community colleges, what policies, resources, values, or other supports made this a particularly effective activity-strategy in Hawaii? Was there anything that went on with the state ITPC that facilitated this new involvement of community colleges? Where did the impetus of the community colleges come from?

LU VAN GELDERN: I think it was a good combination with us. One of the things that's really effective about this grant in Hawaii, and I think we're the only one in the nation that has it, is that we have full-time people in each of the major key agencies. We have a full-time person with the community colleges within the system. It's easier to change a system from within the system than from outside. The whole perspective that they have comes from within their own system. I think that's why it's been so effective. Another thing is that the timing is right. With ADA and the new emphasis, in Hawaii, at least, on 504, they know now that they have to do something. So a lot of the personnel at the community college-level were really ready now to hear what we were saying. And it was effective because it was collaborative between all the agencies. It wasn't just them working on this.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: This next question is on resources. Did the project help to start unique kinds of demonstration activities?

LU VAN GELDERN: Yes, and early on we had an effective speaker, Dr. Jane Jerrold, the Executive Director of AHEAD. She was a really good resource. It was an opportune moment. A lot of things came together to make it effective.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: As a specific result of some of this, we now see special opportunities or more accommodations being made, more communication about the availability of courses -- but we've covered all that. What types of policies, resources, values, or other variables made it difficult to implement this activity or strategy?

LU VAN GELDERN: Well, there are a lot of people at the community colleges who are resistant to making the change. They feel that special education kids shouldn't be at the community college. There are also many special education teachers at the secondary level who don't think their kids are every going to get to a level where they can go to a community college. We still have a pretty segregated system. That's another thing that needs change. In working with teams, when they start to look at improving outcomes for kids with special needs, one of the first things they look at is the need for more inclusion. There's been a lot of impetus to move toward inclusion through this grant. Once they start to look at the collaboration and the outcomes, that's a natural. But, because the kids have been so segregated, there still are some people in the community colleges who feel that what they really need here is a special education system at the community college level. That was mentioned not too long ago at an ITPC, that what we really need is a special education strand.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: What would prevent that from happening?

LU VAN GELDERN: I think there are enough people working together who don't believe that's right direction to go. There is much more communication between people, and I don't think an isolated person with that viewpoint could get very far with it. Also, parents are starting to be more knowledgeable about inclusion.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: So some of this collaboration, because it has allowed for connections to be made across many different parties, has been one means of setting a common direction.

LU VAN GELDERN: Yes. Right after the grant started, one of the people in the Chancellor's office at the community college was making some policy statements about special education students. A couple of the things that she said were in error, and within 24 hours the statements were rescinded. Before we had all of us working together, they could have gone through.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: Is there more of a commitment, or a responsibility that the community colleges sense? I see examples in other states where the community colleges take on an initiative, and what you end up with is a segregated adult program in food service, or something like that. Do you feel that some of the community colleges here sense a greater need for collaboration?

LU VAN GELDERN: Before the grant started, there was one community college that had a wonderful name in special education, but it turned out to be a segregated program. Since the grant has come through, and all this work on collaboration, it's come to light that some of the other colleges are actually doing more, because they have inclusive programs. Before that, the other was the only model for the state. You were talking about interagency, too. The other thing about Hawaii is that we're fortunate enough to have Vocational Rehabilitation working with students in community colleges. That's been very effective.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: What do you see in the future? What do you think community colleges should be doing within a few years?

LU VAN GELDERN: We hope the inclusion movement will keep going, and the expectations for the students at the secondary level will improve. Part of what's happened with the collaboration between secondary teachers and community college people is that it goes both ways. I think the secondary teachers start to look at the fact that they need to upgrade their curriculum and prepare the kids better. And it's not only the community colleges making accommodations. It has to go both ways. We hope that articulation will help both ends, so that more kids can go and be successful at community colleges.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: Let's turn to the second major and valued kind of activity or strategy you've been using, working with teams. Let's ask some similar questions about that. What changes have you seen as a result of this activity?

LU VAN GELDERN: We started with four pilot sites that were school-based. The idea was to develop interagency, or interdisciplinary, teams. I think in the beginning we were hoping for a lot more parent and student involvement. We've tried to get that, but I think a lot of times that isn't the most comfortable mode for the parents and students. It's turned out to be more teacher-based. Out of the 10 teams that we have this year, we have one team that's very much interagency and operates more like an ITPC. Most of them are regular education/special education. One of the things that we've seen a big improvement in is communication between regular education and special education. It operates in a way similar to the community college thing. The expectations increase with special education, and the ability to accommodate increases in regular education.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: Why do you think this activity was one of the most important ones?

LU VAN GELDERN: That's where the real changes are made. We're doing a series of three university classes, starting with team processes and then going into "best practices"and action planning, so the teams always do a mission statement and action planning, and the results of those things are pretty incredible. For instance, the Kuaui team that's meeting now and going into their third class, is going to be re-writing all their vocational curriculum in the spring. They want to articulate the academics with vocational skills for the district. The other thing I mentioned earlier is the thing that I didn't expect, that these things gai momentum across the system. But they quickly become district-based instead of school-based. For instance, the Maui teams used money from the grant to tie the entire district into the transition center. That's been a real plus.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: I know that the project itself has provided for stipends and other kinds of incentives, such as credits, and these have promoted team collaboration. Do you have any specific comments to add on that?

LU VAN GELDERN: I think the reason it's worked is that we're giving university-level graduate credit. We pay for that through the grant. That's a real incentive, because it's tied to the salary schedule. The thing that's not good about it is that it works mostly with the Department of Education, it doesn't work so much with the other agencies. But at this point, it seems that the other agencies are involved because it's such a going thing. When you've got a core group that's really going, the other agencies come along. But we've tried to look for things that were just as effective with other agencies and haven't found them as yet.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: What policies, resources, values, or other supports made this a particularly effective activity or strategy in your state? Let's look at it in terms of policies that would relate to it. I would imagine that there are local kinds of encouragements, or certain types of policies that would make people aware of this kind of training.

LU VAN GELDERN: The policy that helped the most was the fact that the Department of Education decided that you didn't have to have an earned doctorate to get on the doctoral level. You just had to have the credits. That's a policy that worked very much in our direction, as it happened. We did have statewide support from Vocational Rehabilitation and Education, during the summer to bring all the Vocational Rehabilitation counselors into our summer training. The reason that worked is that they got comp time. In the fall and the spring, when we were doing the Saturdays, that doesn't work. You have to keep looking for the thing that's going to click. We had 100% participation from vocational rehabilitation counselors from all 10 sites this summer. We have about 70% participation from Department of Labor transition coordinators. I think again that it's just that they want to be involved. They don't care that much about the credit. When the team really gets strong you start to pull the other ones along. That's critical.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: Any other supports that made this a particularly effective strategy in Hawaii?

LU VAN GELDERN: I can't think of any at this time.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: What barriers were present? What made this difficult to achieve?

LU VAN GELDERN: The barriers are the financial system at the Department of Education. These types of things don't fit into their categories, because they cross all the agencies, giving university credit, but paying for it through the Department of Education. They usually don't do that. They give B credits and undergraduate credits. This is effective because it's graduate-level university credit.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: There's a lot of collaboration involved just in terms of the different agencies that have to support it in different ways.

LU VAN GELDERN: Right. Another barrier was that the University changed its policy and required a doctorate to teach the classes. Three of the people on the grant who were going to teach classes couldn't any longer. That was a barrier.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: A general question again. Why do you think this activity was effective?

LU VAN GELDERN: I think the main reason it was effective was that we didn't have any hidden agendas. We just went into the schools and said, "Our agenda is to improve outcomes for kids." Once we said that — because what we were trying to do was to get them to come up with their own solutions. If we had gone in with preconceived ideas about what the outcome needed to be, I don't think they would have bought in. A lot of the teams have gone way beyond what we expected because of that. It's an empowering, grass-roots activity.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: Let's move on to asking about some of the specifics of the third most important strategy which has evolved out of the project based on collaboration. Would you talk again about what the strategy is, and then the specifics.

LU VAN GELDERN: The third system I've seen a lot of change in is the Department of Labor's transition coordinators. There are 17 Department of Labor transition centers in the state, housed at the high schools, but with employees hired by the Department of Labor. One of the prime objectives of the project was to get full inclusion for special education kids in those centers. The way we've been effective is to hire part-time teachers who serve as the bridge between Department of Labor and Department of Education. Their primary job is to improve access into the centers' services. When the grant started, it wasn't clear how long those positions would be in place. One of the things we had to do was to make it clear that it was a temporary position for one-year, because it was a systems change. I think one of our tendencies here in Hawaii is to throw bodies at problems. If they have a problem, they try to hire another person. At the conference on Saturday, the teams representing one of the part-

time teachers made it clear that the reason she was effective was that her position was temporary. They have to do needs assessments and improve the system. It's like what I said about the state ITPC. You don't want the thing to depend on the project. You want the project only to enhance and improve. We have full access special education kids at Maui High School, where we worked last year. We have full access for at Castle High School. They're still working on it at Baldwin, but they have a plan to get to it. I think eventually we'll have full access at all of the sites we've worked at. Each school is coming up with its own solutions.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: You just answered a lot of the next question: Why do you think this activity is one of the most important? Anything else to add on that?

LU VAN GELDERN: I think the bottom line is that it caused the communication lines to open up between special education and the Department of Labor and regular education. In the past, special education has handled their own. I think there was a feeling in the schools that the special education teachers and kids didn't really need to be included in any of these initiatives, because they were already doing so much for the kids.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: What policies, resources, values, or other supports made this a particularly effective activity or strategy in Hawaii?

LU VAN GELDERN: The teams are what made it happen. If we had just hired part-time teachers and put them in the schools, it wouldn't have. It was always a difficult job to describe and define, because it's a position that is hired by the Department of Education but housed partially in the Department of Labor. There were always questions about it. But that was done for a particular reason. It was done to change the system, because it forced communication. Then, having the teams helped define the role of the part-time teacher and caused a real change in communication, because it brought in a lot of other people. It brought in 10 people in the school instead of the 2 people who would have been working with the teacher.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: Did this require additional resources to make it happen, or was it basically just a shift in policy?

LU VAN GELDERN: No, it was absolutely a part-time position funded by the grant. It wouldn't have happened otherwise.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: What value changes seemed to occur?

LU VAN GELDERN: In the past the special education population was basically left out, and nobody thought there was any problem with that. Now it's really been brought to the attention of people that that's not a given. It's not acceptable anymore.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: What barriers were present?

LU VAN GELDERN: One of the major barriers was that the Department of Labor — this particular branch of the Department of Labor — keeps getting cut in funding. We came at a time when their personnel had been cut almost in half. If we had come in saying, "Now we want you to serve more, all the special education kids," it would have been difficult. Instead, we said, "The special education kids need the services from this center, and we're going to hire a teacher to help you figure out how to get those services to those kids. It doesn't necessarily mean that you will do it. It just means that you as a group need to figure out how it's going to be done." In one case, for instance, at Maui High School, the special education transition teacher is giving the careers workshops to the special education kids. They're modified for them. At Baldwin High School, the part-time teacher schedules the special education kids into the workshops that are already going on. It caused a real problem, because they had just been cut, and they were stretched thin, and here we came in with something to help — staff support.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: Any other barriers?

LU VAN GELDERN: That memorandum of agreement was a barrier. We'd made recommendations to modify that memorandum of agreement between the Departments of Labor and Education that has to do with the centers. Again, the political climate right now is bad for these formal agreements. We need to remember that.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: You have Private Industry Councils here. How are they responding?

LU VAN GELDERN: I've tried hard to get Private Industry Council representation. We have it only at the Kauai ITPC. At the state level, it's political, and the people are appointed. It's hard to get contact. I won't give up. That's another thing I still need to do, especially now that we've restructured the state ITPC. We haven't had a good connection with them.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: Does the Private Industry Council in any way show up as a barrier?

LU VAN GELDERN: Not really. They have a good JTPA summer program that supports a lot of our kids, but it's separate from the other things that are going on. We need to bring them in. I was actively involved in Colorado with the Private Industry Council.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: Why do you think this activity was effective?

LU VAN GELDERN: It was effective because we gave them help. We didn't just say, "This is something you have to do." We also allowed them to come up with their own methods.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: What are some of the activities or strategies that you would never try again, and why?

LU VAN GELDERN: There's really not anything. I feel that the project was well written, and I don't feel that there was anything major that we've tried that wasn't effective.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: Hawaii was among a handful of states that had an early start in transition, so there was a lot of groundwork laid. That helped to focus things for the next steps.

LU VAN GELDERN: There are a couple of things that I totally recommend that were especially effective. One is that we have coordinators within the agencies, and another is that we've allowed local people to make their own choices within a framework.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: What activities or strategies didn't work that you think might work under different circumstances or conditions? Your answer to the one before covers that. The next one is: What resources, if any, had agencies or communities shared at the state or local level? As you recall, in the RFP, there was a comment about resource-pooling and cost-sharing. Where has that taken place in the project?

LU VAN GELDERN: There was a lot of that. The FVVR program at the secondary level, for instance. As for positions, the community college or employment training center gave us a full-time position on the grant. That's an ongoing position for special needs coordination. That was a sharing of resources. There was a lot of cross-training, and sharing in that way. For instance, the Special Education Conference moved in conjunction with Pacific Rim to share the speakers. The University Affiliated Program is now managing the state Special Education Conference for us that developed out of some recommendations through the people who were collaborating together on the grant. There also was cross-training in the classes, with state-level support for vocational rehabilitation counselors to come in, and a lot of sharing of information. As for services to students, there are

a lot of conversations at the interagency level, at the district level, about avoiding duplication of services. The agencies have become better about sharing what their roles are and what their programs are, so that they can be sure that kids don't fall between the cracks. A lot of things have happened in the past. For instance, vocational rehabilitation generally is kind of a gate-keeper and will refer kids to the Department of Health if they're not appropriate for vocational rehabilitation. There are a lot of natural things that are occurring in Hawaii already.

DAVID R. JOHNSON: The last question is a summary question. Overall, in relation to the broad topic of community collaboration/interagency collaboration, how would you describe the changes that have been made?

LU VAN GELDERN: I think we've brought it down to a local level. There was good collaboration at the state level before, but we've had significant improvement at the district level.

Appendix E

Context: Questions and Data Sources

CONTEXTUAL DESCRIPTION
GENERAL DESCRIPTION

Question	Sources
1. Describe the overall population of the state. Is it largely rural, does it vary across the state? Is the population heterogenous or homogenous?	Original proposal, Almanac
2. Describe the overall economic conditions of the state. What is the source of industry? What is the typical income? What is the unemployment rate? (Does it vary across the state?) What is the economic history (e.g. is it recovering from a deficiet, did it just lose major businesses?)	Original proposal, School-Work state plan
3. Describe the structure of state VR, DHS, and Education agencies.	Original proposal
4. What was the status of transition service delivery at the time of grant submission? Describe how transition policy developed prior to that time.	Original proposal
5. Describe the political constituency of the state. Is it generally conservative or liberal? Does it typically support state funding of programs? What are the major issues of the legislature? Does it appear to support education, programs for people with disabilities, transition? What are other competing priorities within the state?	Political directory, Interviews
6. Describe the political consituency of the state agency heads. What is their priority? Where does transition fit in their priorities?	Interviews

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CONTEXTUAL DESCRIPTION
YOUTH AND FAMILY ENGAGEMENT IN TRANSITON

QUESTION	SOURCES
Characteristics of families & services	
1. What are the demographic characteristics of families in the state? Are they largely single-parent, two-parent, or second-generation families? Do they tend to be permanent residents of a school district, or is there a lot of relocation? To what extent do these characteristics vary across the state?	Interview with project director, Survey of state parent participants
2. What types of involvement do the families tend to have in the educational program of the person with a disability? What is their knowledge of transition services? To what extent do these characteristics vary across the state?	Interview with project director, Survey of state parent participants
3. What is the history o f transition service delivery to youth with disabilities and their families? What types of services are available upon leaving school? What types of waiting lists exist?To what extent do these vary across the state?	Project data, (e.g. needs survey) Interview with agency representatives
4. What access do youth with disabilities and their families have to information about their rights and types of services? To what extent do these characteristics vary across the state?	Interview with project director, Project data Survey of state parent participants
Attitudes and Values	
6. What types of outcomes do youth with disabilities and their families anticipate/desire upon exiting school? To what extent do these vary across the state?	Project data Interview with project director, parent participants
7. How satisified are youth with disabilities and their families about the information they receive, the services that are available, and the role they play in the transition planning process? To what extent do these characteristics vary across the state?	Project data Interview with project director, parent participants
8. What is the role of the state parent center? What do they see as the major family issues within the state?	Survey of state parent centers and project participants
Stability of service delivery and resource allocation	
9. To what extent are services dependent upon temporary, external funding (e.g. soft money)? How long have they been funded this way? How many services have ended because funding stopped?	Interview with project director, agency representatives

CONTEXTUAL DESCRIPTION
AGENCY AND COMMUNITY COLLABORATION

QUESTION	SOURCES
Skills and qualifications of personnel/leadership	
1. What are the certification requirements for working in a transition-related position? Are there specific certification categories for transition-related positions? How many practioners have special education certification?	**Certification survey**
2. What transition-rleated curriculum exists at a preservice level? Are there specific degrees related to transition?What percentage of practitioners have received any training in transition (before 1990, after 1990)?	**Certification survey Interview with project director, project data (e.g., anticipated needs survey)**
3. What is the educational background and experience of the state agency heads?	**Interview with project director, state agency heads, vita**
Attitudes and values	
4. What are the stated missions and philosophies of the individual state and local agencies responsible fo r service delivery?	**State board documents, missions and guiding principles**
5. What is the stated mission and philosophy of state and local interagency agreements?	**Actual documents**
6. What are the priorities of each of the state agency heads (where does transition fit)?	**Interview with state agency heads**
Fiscal resources	
7. What is the financial history of each of the agencies? What is the size of their budget? What percentage of it goes to transition-related services? Do they access all availablel Federal dollars?	**Interview with state agency heads, project directors**
Organizational structure and capacity	
8. How are the agencies related to each other in terms of authority? How are the agencies organized within themselves(e.g. relationship of SDE to LEA)?	**Agency organizational charts Interview with state agencies, project directors**
History	
9. What previous attempts have been made for agency and community collaboration? What were the effects of those attempts?	**Interview with project director Analysis of previous and current interagency agreements**

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CONTEXTUAL DESCRIPTION
PROFESSIONAL SKILLS AND KNOWLEDGE

QUESTION	SOURCES
Skills and qualifications of personnel	
1. What are the certification requirements for working in a transition-related position? Are there specific certification categories for transition-related positions? How many practioners have special education certification?	**Certification survey**
2. What transition-related curriculum exists at a preservice level? Are there specific degrees related to transition? What percentage of practitioners have received any training in transition (before 1990, after 1990)? To what extent do these characterisitcs vary across the state?	**Certification survey Interview with project director, Project data (e.g., anticipated needs survey) Placement of preservice graduates**
Attitudes and values	
3. To what extent do professionals involved in the delivery of transition services believe that people with disabilities can work in the community? To what extent do these characteristics vary across the state? (Note: these have 2 levels to them: a) type of disability, and b) level of inclusion)	**???? I don't know, do we really want to try to answer these???**
4. To what extent do professionals involved in the delivery of transition services believe that people with disabilities should live in the community as independently as possible? To what extent do these characteristics vary across the state?	
Formal and informal decision making processes	
5. What the formal state and local patterns of decision making in regards to transition services ? To what extent do these characteristics vary across the state?	**Interagency agreements, Interview with project director**
6. Are there any informal state and local patterns of decision making in regards to transition services? If so, what are they? To what extent do these characteristics vary across the state?	**Interview with project director, agency representatives**

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix F

Context: Activity Matrix

State Systems Change Projects on Transition
Summary of Project Activities

Activities	# of States Engaged In Activity	States
Improve Knowledge and Skills		
• Conduct assessments of transition needs, training needs, barriers to success, employers' knowledge of transition	14	CT, IA, KS, MA, ND,MI OR, UT, VT, VA,NJ,OH FL,IN
• Design/deliver training to state agency staff, providers, employers, advocates, transition teams and others	26	AR,CO,CT,HI,IA,KS,KY, ME,MA, MI, MN,NE,NJ NH,NMNY,NC,ND, OR,TX,UT,VT,VA,WA,WI OH,FL,IN
• Deliver technical assistance to agency staff, service providers, LEA staff, employers, advocates, transition teams	20	AR,CO,ME,MA,MN,NH NY,NC,ND,OR,UT,VT, VA,WA,MI,NJ,WI,OH, FL,IN
• Organize/participate in interagency conferences aimed at state agency staff, providers, LEA staff, and families/youth	13	AR,CA,CT,KS,MA,MN, OR,VT,MI,NJ,OH,FL,IN
• Provide training for families/youth in transition planning	22	AR,CT,HI,IA,KS,KY,ME MN,NH,NM,NY,NC,ND OR,TX,UT,VT,MI,NJ, OH,FL,IN
stablish/expand family and youth involvement in transition planning through provision of raining in:		
Self empowerment/determination/advocacy	14	CO,CT,HI,IA,MN,NH, VT,VA,MI,NJ,WI,OH FL,IN
Consumer case management	5	MI,NC,TX,OH,IN
Personal futures planning	8	CT,KS,MI,NJ,WI,OH, FL,IN
Peer supports/natural supports	5	MI,NH,NM,FL,IN
• Encourage family involvement in support groups and advocacy organizations	10	AR,CA,KS,ME,MI,MN, NJ,OH,FL,IN
• Conduct public forums/community meetings on transition issues and transition policy; obtain consumer input regarding methods for publicizing transition best-practice strategies	11	HI,KS,MA,MI,NH,NJ, NC,WA,OH,FL,IN
• Develop/update resource directories of providers, best-practice sites, examples of successful collaboration; develop clearinghouse for information/referral/dissemination	13	AR,CO,CT,MA,NJ, NY,ND,TX,WA,WI, OH,FL,IN
• Infuse transition-related training into college/university level undergraduate and graduate level courses	9	CO,CT,MN,NH,NJ ND,UT,FL,IN
• Increase families' knowledge of transition by publicizing information about project activities and available resources	13	CT,HI,KS,MA,NH, NJ,NC,ND,WI,WV OH,FL,IN
• Increase involvement of minority families through targeted mailings, outreach activities, training modules modified for cultural diversity	6	CT,NJ,NC,VA,OH,FL
Improve Working Relationships		
• Clarify/develop interagency agreements regarding agencies' roles and responsibilities; establish formal and informal relationships with key organizations, committees, post-secondary institutions, and legislators	17	AR,CT,HI,KS,KY,ME, NH,NJ,NC,ND,TX,UT, WI,WV,OH,FL,IN
stablish focus groups, transition teams, governing boards, advocacy committees; ensure broad presentation and cultural diversity	22	AR,CA,CO,HI,IA,KS, KY,MA,MN,NE,NH,VA, NJ,ND,OR,TX,UT,VT, OH,FL,IN

Activities	# of States Engaged In Activity	States
• Disperse project staff across state agency offices; encourage dialogue with state-level staff, providers, and employers; pair staff from various agencies as project co-directors	13	CO,CT,HI,IA,MI,MN, NJ,NY,TX,WI,OH,FL,IN
• Assist in local interagency planning and collaboration; ensure equal involvement of participating agencies, promote information sharing and use of fiscal and personnel resources	11	CA,KY,MI,NJ,ND,OH TX,WI,WV,FL,IN
• Ensure linkages between project activities and existing state/federal transition projects; collaborate with education and adult service agencies on transition planning issues	11	AR,KS,MI,NJ,NY, OR,TX,WI,OH,FL,IN
Promote Systems Change		
• Review and analyze state and federal transition policy; identify and enact needed legislation to change policy	15	AR,CA,CO,MA,MI,MN, NJ,ND,VT,VA,WI,WV OH,FL,IN
• Establish consensus at local levels regarding transition planning procedures (e.g., transition team responsibilities, single planning documents, reciprocal assessment, use of transition case managers, work training programs)	11	AR,CA,MI,NE,NJ,NM, TX,WI,WV,OH,FL
• Identify critical issues, duplication of services, service gaps, barriers to access; develop/recommend policy and procedure changes to address problem areas	15	AR,CA,IA,KS,MI,NJ, NC,ND,VT,WA,WV VA,OH,FL,IN
• Support state task force activities, demonstration projects, transition team activities; assist in identification of strategies for pooling resources and expanding preservice transition-related training	16	CT,KS,ME,MI,MN, NH,NJ,NM,NC,ND, VA,WI,WV,OH,FL,IN
Provide various incentives to stakeholders to increase sense of ownership and support of projects' efforts	15	CT,KS,ME,MI,MN,MH, NJ,NM,NC,ND,VA,WI, WV,OH,IN
• Establish one agency as point of entry into transition planning	3	HI,MI,NJ
• Establish multiple sites throughout state for coordination of transition planning	3	MI,NJ,NY
Evaluate Project Effectiveness		
• Conduct project specific quantitative/qualitative data collection	14	AR,CT,IA,KS,MI,MN, NJ,NM,NY,ND,VA,WI OH,FL
• Conduct/support development of statewide surveys of transition needs	13	AR,CA,CT,MA,MI,OH NJ,TX,VT,WA,WV,FL,IN
• Participate in development of state/local systems for collection of follow-along/follow-up data	12	AR,CT,MI,NJ,NC,TX, VT,VA,WA,WV,FL,IN
• Assist in development/utilization of stateagency databases for use in transition planning	14	IA,KS,KY,MI,NE, NC,ND,OR,WA,WI, WV,OH,FL,IN
• Conduct follow-up studies/outcome evaluations	7	CT,MI,TX,VT,WA,WV,FL
• Conduct cost-benefit analyses for students who participated in transition planning	3	HI,MI,FL
• Conduct surveys/collect data to assess impact/effectiveness of project activities, policy change, and procedural change	14	AR,IA,KY,MA,MI,MN, NH,NJ,NY,OR,VT,WV OH,FL
• Identify/study issues critical to transition of individuals from minority groups	4	MI,ND,OH,FL
Demonstrations/Innovations		
• Assist local school districts/ agencies/communities to develop model programs; provide stipends and/or on-site training and technical assistance for implementation	17	CO,CT,HI,MI,MN,OH NE,NH,NJ,NM,NC, OR,VA,WA,WI,FL,IN
• Develop guidelines for provision of rehabilitation counseling as a related service; pilot test feasibility of providing rehabilitation counseling during transition planning process	5	MI,NE,NJ,TX,WI
Develop videotapes dealing with transition planning	5	IA,ME,NJ,OH,FL
• Develop transition-focused core components and content for secondary school curricula	15	CO,CT,HI,MI,MN,NE, NH,NM,NC,OR,VA,WA, WI,FL,IN

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix G

Context: Sample State Description

North Dakota

North Dakota ranks as the forty-seventh state in terms of population (under 640,000) (1) and is one of the least densely populated states in the country. The state's population has remained stable since the 1930s (2). In comparison to most other states, a larger percentage of North Dakotans live in rural areas (47%) (1). The population is ethnically homogeneous, with 94% of the population being white. Four percent (4%) are Native American (1).

The primary economic activities in North Dakota are agriculture, mining, manufacturing, and tourism (2). The unemployment rate has consistently been lower than the national average, fluctuating between four and five per cent since 1980. However, the annual pay for North Dakotans also has consistently been below the national average since 1980 (1).

Rural areas of North Dakota have experienced limited growth over the past decade and job opportunities in these areas are limited. Many rural youth must leave their communities to obtain employment after leaving high school (4).

The Department of Public Instruction is the lead agency in education. There are numerous local school districts across North Dakota. Many North Dakota students attend rural schools that are not located near major industries or businesses. Thus, forming school/business partnerships and arranging job sites are especially difficult (4). The state VR and DHS agencies operate from a regional basis. There are eight regions in the state (4).

Statewide transition efforts in North Dakota began in 1984 with a two year federal project that addressed transition planning and services. Among the most important accomplishments of this project was a revised interagency agreement among the DPI (Department of Public Instruction), DVR (Division of Vocational Rehabilitation), Job Service, Developmental Disabilities Division of the Department of Human Services (DD), and the State Board of Vocational Education (SBVE). Additionally, in 1985 the State Transition Planning Council passed a joint rule requiring transition planning for all students 14 years of age or older. While these early transition efforts were important, the lack of technical assistance available to

schools and local communities was a major barrier to improving services on a statewide basis (4).

Prior to grant submission a statewide follow-up study was initiated in North Dakota in 1989. The findings of this study were similar to studies completed in other states: there was a large unemployment rate, most youth did not live independently, a small percentage attended postsecondary education and training programs, and most continued to be economically dependent on their families. This study helped to justify the need to focus special efforts on transition (4).

A state level transition planning council was formed in the late 1980s to provide leadership for transition efforts. Regional and local committees were in the process of organizing at the time that the grant was submitted. Special education personnel, rehabilitation counselors, representatives of adult service organizations, and youth and family members are expected to be involved on transition teams at the community and individual levels (4). As is the case in many other states, the quality of transition services in North Dakota varies considerably from locality to locality (4).

North Dakota historically has been a conservative state dominated by the Republican party. The Governor of North Dakota has relatively strong powers in regard to appointments and legislation passage (2).

"Audit Trail" Coding for North Dakota

(1) - Statistical Abstract of the United States 1993

(2) - Academic American Encyclopedia

(4) - Application Grant for systems change project

Appendix H

Evaluation Timeline

EVALUATION
Activities and Timelines

Contextual Variables

Identification of Project Activities	completed 12/93
General State Descriptions	
initial draft	completed 8/94
updates	6/95, 6/96
Agency and Community Collaboration	
initial draft	8/95
supplemental interview information	12/96
Youth and Family Engagement	
Parent Survey	3/95
initial draft	8/95
Professional Knowledge and Skill Development	
Certification Survey	completed 5/94
initial draft	12/96

Project Director Interviews

Final set of questions	10/25/94
Pilot test	11/30/94
Implementation	94/95 site visits 96/97 site visits
Data entry/analysis	ongoing

Exit Interviews with Project Directors

Final set of questions	5/95
Pilot test	8/95
Implementation	95/96 site visits (12) 96/97 site visits (12)
Data entry/analysis	ongoing